DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 389 EA 022 041

AUTHOR Caruso, Joseph J.
TITLE Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities of Principals to Teacher Leaders and Novice Teachers in Four Connecticut Schools: A Close-Up Look.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 118p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990). Some pages contain faded, light type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Responsibility; *Beginning Teacher Induction; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Interprofessional Relationship; Leadership Styles; Principals; Professional Development; Supervision; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Orientation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

Two Connecticut programs designed to support beginning teachers, the Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) and the Cooperating Teacher Program (CT), are grounded in the collaborative leadership concept. A working partnership between principals and mentor teachers shares responsibility with a state assessment team to support and evaluate new teachers. Identification of principals' supervisory roles and responsibilities to teachers and an examination of principal-teacher interaction in the collaborative process is the purpose of this study. Data were collected from indepth interviews with 15 participating educators, an expert panel discussion, and document analysis. Findings indicate that little collaborative supervision occurred, due to an imbalance of power and impaired communication based on state confidentiality requirements. However, teachers felt supported by principals, and principals demonstrated effective instructional leadership. Results suggest that the BEST and CT programs enhance opportunities for improving instructional leadership by principals and teachers. Recommendations are offered for principal training, role clarification, and school improvement. Tables summarize characteristics of interaction among supervisors, mentor teachers, and beginning teachers. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321389

SUPERVISORY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRINCIPALS TO TEACHER LEADERS AND NOVICE TEACHERS IN FOUR CONNECTICUT SCHOOLS: A CLOSE-UP LOOK

Joseph J. Caruso, Ed.D.
Professor and Chair
Education Department
Framingham State College
100 State Street, Dwight Hall 308
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701-9101

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Boston, Massachusetts
April, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph J. Caruso

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA022 041

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Context	-
II.	Objectives of the Study	6
III.	Data Source and Methodology	7
IV.	Significance of Study	10
V.	Findings of the Study	10
VI.	Findings by Case	
	School #1	13
	School #2	36
	School #3	48
	School #4	70
VII.	Focus Group Findings	81
VIII.	Findings Across Cases	89
IX.	Discussion	107
X.	Recommendations	110
XI.	Acknowledgements	
XII.	References	

List of Tables

School #1

		Page
1.	Principal #1's Supervision of Cooperating Teachers at Student-teacher	14
2.	Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher	18
3.	Principal #1's, Supervision of Mentor Teachers and Beginning Teachers	20
4.	Mentor Teacher #1's Supervision of Beginning Teacher	26
5.	Mentor Teacher #2's Supervision of Beginning Teacher	27

School #2

6.	Principal #2: Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher	37
7.	Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Mentor Teacher and Beginning Teacher	42

School #3

8.	Principal #3's Supervision of Beginning Teacher	49
9.	Mentor Teacher's Supervision of Beginning Teacher	54
10.	Principal #3's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher	57
11.	Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher	62

School #4

12.	Principal #4's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher	77
13.	Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher	78

Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities of Principals to Teacher Leaders and Novice Teachers in Four-Connecticut Schools: A Close-up Look

Context

During the 1980's, almost every state has enacted legislation to reform teacher education, licensing, and compensation (Darling-Hammond, 1988). The intent of much of the changes is to raise the status of teachers and to make teaching more professional by improving the working conditions of teachers, reducing teacher isolation, increasing the role of teachers in decision-making processes which affect their work, strengthening their educational preparation, and raising standards for entry into the profession. Many of these changes were percipitated by A Nation at Risk (1983) and, of course, the two major national reports which specifically called for changes in the preparation of teachers and in the profession of teaching itself, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986) and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986).

In Connecticut, the State legislature passed the Educational Enhancement Act (EEA) in 1986, which includes five major programs (The Connecticut Continuum) designed to support the teaching profession. Two of these programs, the Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) and the Cooperating Teacher Program (CT) are specifically intended to improve the quality of teaching. They include procedures whereby experienced teachers can serve as support persons to beginners and interns by assuming the role of mentor or cooperating teacher. In addition to receiving assistance from experienced teachers, beginning teachers are assessed by a team of individuals who determine the extent to which they demonstrate an understanding and practice of the Connecticut Teaching Competencies. The Competencies also serve as a guide for the cooperating teachers in their work with student-teachers.

The goals of the BEST program are to (Goranson):

- improve teaching and therefore student learning through the support and assessment of beginning teachers;
- increase the retention of promising teachers during the induction years;
- promote the personal and professional well-being of beginning teachers through intensive ongoing support from mentors;
- transmit the culture of the school and school district to the beginning teacher through ongoing professional development;
- improve the quality of beginning teachers through competency-based assessment; and
- develop teacher leadership in the education profession by recognizing and using the expertise of Connecticut's exemplary teachers as mentors and assessors (pp. 2, 3).

The Cooperating Teacher Program has the following objectives (Goranson):

- to bridge the learning from a university setting to a classroom teaching experience
- to improve student learning through the support of an experienced exemplary classroom teacher
- to aid in the preparation of a professional teaching force
- to improve the quality of classroom teaching through a competency-based approach
- to develop teacher leadership in the education profession by utilizing the expertise of Connecticut's veteran teachers as cooperating teachers (p. 3).

Although not explicitly stated, both programs are grounded in the concept of collaborative leadership, whereby teachers and principals share responsibility for the supervision of beginning teachers and for the support of pre-service teachers. The intention is to encourage a working partnership between principals and teachers.

For teachers, the new leadership/supervisory roles of assessor, mentor, and cooperating teacher mean that they now have input into important decisions which affect colleagues as well as future teachers. Although some teachers relish this opportunity for active leadership, others are unprepared for or

feel uncomfortable assessing peers and supervising beginning teachers and interns. Those with a narrow view of their role see such activities as taking valuable time away from their primary function - teaching young people. How do principals enable teachers to assume these new roles?

Although concepts of the principal as collaborative leader are just beginning to emerge (Liebermann, 1988), such leadership implies that principals be instructional leaders. Such a task may be easier for those principals who already perceive themselves as key figures in improving instruction in their schools and who view teachers as allies in this process. For others, comfortable, happy, and even effective in their roles of "father figure", building manager, or strong disciplinarian, the notion of sharing instructional supervisory responsibility with newly "empowered" staff members may be threatening and even unnecessary. Such administrators are uncomfortable with the concept of teacher empowerment. They are uncertain as to what it means for them and their role. Some see the empowerment of teachers as "a taking away of power" from them, rather than as an enhancement of their power. Others see involvement in EEA programs as time-consuming, requiring that they direct their attention away from functions which they perceive to be more important.

Both groups, then, teachers and principals, are experiencing role conflict and ambiguity as they struggle to reconceptualize their roles in terms of their personal expectations and the expectations of state policies, such as the BEST and the CT programs.

The success of the BEST and CT programs is heavily dependent on how principals perceive and enact their roles. How do they supervise program participants? In what ways do they support the development of teacher leaders? And how do they share instructional supervisory responsibilities with them?

Administratrors can, of course, facilitate or impede the development of positive experiences among teachers by the way in which they structure school environments. For example, some principals are able to arrange for time for teachers to work with one another during the school day, help to strengthen relationships between mentor and beginning teachers, provide supportive direction through the supervision of mentors and beginners and assist all parties in understanding the goals and values of the school (Perrotta, 1988). Teacher participation as a mentor or cooperating teacher is oftentimes dependent on principal's attitudes, their encouragement, and even their recruiting attempts.

On the other hand, tension between principals and teacher leaders can develop over the misuse of mentor teachers when, for example, administrators inappropriately place them in trouble-shooting roles with ineffective veteran teachers, over issues of confidentiality regarding the teaching performance of beginners, over new status levels of teacher leaders, and over conflicts in roles between mentors and principals, particularly with respect to teacher assessment and evaluation (Shulman, 1988, Rodman, 1987).

In Connecticut, one source of possible conflict with respect to principal's supervisory role is the assessment of beginning teachers by a team consisting of an administrator from within the district, but not the building principal; an experienced teacher from another district, and a state assessor. The beginning teacher is evaluated during the school year, the results of which become a major factor in determining the awarding of provisional certificate to that teacher from the State.

This assessment process takes place separately from that developed by the school district in which the principal evaluates the beginning teacher according to district guidelines in order to make decisions regarding contract

renewal. The building principal is not required to be trained in assessing teachers using the Connecticut Teaching Competencies and, most likely, uses a different instrument and procedure. It is possible that the principal may independently arrive at an assessment of the beginning teacher that is at variance with that of the state assessment team.

The roles and responsibilities of the principal to the cooperating teacher and student-teacher appear to be less troublesome, yet less defined. The interest and support of the principal in the pre-service component, which includes university supervisors, could certainly impact on the effectiveness of the CT program and the school as well. Principals with a collaborative mind-set toward instructional leadership could, for example, seize the opportunity at hand by using the pre-service training component as a means of school improvement by encouraging more teachers to work with student-teachers; by fostering stronger partnerships with universities toward the development of professional development centers (Holmes Group, 1986) by developing activities whereby student-teachers are socialized into the profession such as orientation sessions or training seminars with cooperating teachers, and by modeling effective supervision for the cooperating teacher.

The BEST and CT programs are two components of the Connecticut Educational Enhancement Act (EEA) designed to improve the quality of instruction in schools. Both programs are creating pressure on principals to restructure their roles and offer opportunities to create new models for school effectiveness. The ways in which principals sort out, re-align, and enact their roles and responsibilities with respect to instructional supervision will be critical toward developing a new definition of principal and teacher instructional leadership in schools.

During the first two pilot year of the BEST and CT programs, more than 60 school districts participated in either or both programs. Although some attention has been given to the implications of the BEST program on the principals' role (Gillette and Stern, 1988), further study is needed. Little research has been conducted with respect to the principal's role in relation to the Cooperating Teacher Program (CT) or how principals' activities affect the success of both programs. Greater clarity about principals supervisory roles and responsibilities to BEST and CT program participants would be of assistance to educators, particularly since both programs are to be implemented statewide in September, 1989.

Objectives of the Study

This study addresses the following questions:

1. What are the supervisory roles and responsibilities of principals to teacher leaders and novice teachers in selected pilot schools as perceived by BEST and CT program participants?
2. What is the nature of the principal's supervision of BEST and CT program participants (mentor teachers, beginning teachers, cooperating teachers and student-teachers) in each of the four pilot schools?
3. What is the difference between principals' and teacher leaders' supervision of novices and do principals' and teacher leaders share the supervision of novices?
4. How do the BEST and CT programs effect the principal's supervisory role(s) and responsibilities and how does the principal's supervision affect the success of the BEST and CT programs?

Data Source and Methodology

1. Fifteen Connecticut administrators, recognized for their success in implementing EEA programs were named Connecticut Administrator Fellows and participated in a special fellowship program in December, 1988. From this pool, two principals agreed to take part in this study, as did teachers in their schools. As the Administrator Fellows included principals from schools which were not pilot schools for the BEST and CT programs, two additional principals were selected from the pool of applicants to the fellowship program. A total of 17 educators from 4 schools were the primary data source for this study. In addition to 4 principals, subjects included 3 mentor teachers, 2 beginning teachers, 4 cooperating teachers, and 4 student-teachers.

2. An in-depth, semi-structured interview was conducted with each of the four principals to determine their perceptions of their supervisory roles and responsibilities to BEST and CT program participants, the nature of their supervision of BEST and CT program participants; how they share and the extent to which their share supervisory roles and responsibilities with teacher leaders (mentors and cooperating teachers); and their effect on the BEST and CT programs.

3. A series of semi-structured individual interviews was held with pairs of cooperating teachers and student-teachers and/or mentor teachers and beginning teachers in each school to determine the nature of their interaction with the school principal; their perceptions of the ways in which the principal supervises and supports them; the nature and extent to which the principal shares supervision of novices with mentor and cooperating teachers, how the principal affects the success of the BEST and CT programs, and the ways in which teacher leader supervise and support novices.

Interviews were conducted from January to June, 1988.

4. The interviews were taped and transcribed. As a result of an analysis of the data, a typology of categories and their definitions was developed to describe the supervisory roles of principals and teacher leaders.

5. A group of 10 graduates students and colleagues were trained to code the interviews using the categories. Data-coders were asked to determine the presence of a category and to indicate the specific language in the interview falling within each identified category. Each interview was reviewed by 2 - 4 independent coders.

6. Data were organized by case study to permit an examination of the principal's supervisory roles and responsibilities in each school and to compare the perspectives of principals and teachers about the principal's supervision thus permitting a triangulation of the findings.

7. A second data source consisted of a panel of 10 experts who participated in a two hour focus group in May, 1988. Panel members included: 3 principals from pilot districts; 1 superintendent of schools; 1 representative from the State Board of Education; 1 representative from a regional education center (Cooperative Educational Services); 1 district facilitator who had also served as a mentor teacher and trainer of mentors, and 2 mentor teachers and 1 cooperating teacher.

Focus group members were selected by the following criteria:

a) involvement in conceptualizing/developing the BEST and/or CT programs

b) involvement in helping to pilot the BEST or CT programs at the school level

c) individuals identified by others as experts on the BEST or CT programs

d) individuals known by reputation to have an in-depth understanding of the roles and responsibilities of principals

e) individuals who have participated in the training of principals

The panel of experts discussed what the nature of the principal's supervisory role(s) and responsibilities should be to the BEST and CT programs and participants in them. The discussion was transcribed, analyzed, and summarized by major topic. This data added validity to the case study findings.

8) A third source of data consisted of BEST and CT program documents, state-wide evaluation and research studies, and other literature dealing with the principals' supervisory roles and responsibilities to teacher leaders and novice teachers.

9) Data were also organized across cases to compare and contrast the cases, to identify common patterns and differences so as to determine which supervisory roles were more in evidence, and to validate information obtained from interviews with focus group findings and program documents.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study represented a small sample population; as both programs were in pilot stages, there were few pairs of teachers participating within schools.

2. The study did not include subjects from large, urban school districts, due in part to the rural nature of Connecticut and the fact that few urban principals applied to be Administrator Fellows, the pool from which subjects were identified.

3. The study did not directly address the relationship of the principal to college supervisors of student-teachers or statewide assessors of beginning teachers.

4. There was some overlap among some of the categories used to code the data.

5. In some cases, coders needed more interview data in order to make their judgments:

Significance of the Study

1. The study provides rich data at the micro level which describes how the central figures in the BEST and CT programs at the school level perceive principals' supervisory roles and responsibilities, thus complementing larger statewide studies of these programs.

2. The study reinforces the notion of the principal as key to the success of the BEST and CT programs at the building level.

3. The study points to the importance of the principal's supervision of all staff and the need for principals to have a repertoire of supervisory strategies and skills.

Findings of the Study

The findings are reported in three ways: 1) there are four case studies in which perceptions of subjects about the principal's supervisory roles and responsibilities are described; 2) a summary of the focus group discussion is provided; and 3) patterns and generalizations across cases are reported.

As the supervisory roles of principals and teacher leaders are described and compared within each case study in terms of the typology of categories which formed the basis of data coding, the typology is included below. Subjects are described by the particular category only if a majority of data-coders attributed a supervisory role to them.

Principals' Supervisory Roles

Monitor/Coordinator
- keeps watchful eye on program
- ensures that novices are working with qualified staff
- interviews when necessary
- arranges for placements
- meets with parties
- arranges for release-time

Trainer
- conducts training sessions
- gives staff articles to read

Role Model
- demonstrates attitude or supervisory skills which mentor or cooperating teachers imitate when working with novices

Enabler
- establishes positive professional climate in school
- makes positive and supportive comments
- makes novices feel welcome
- treats teachers with respect
- provides good training site
- offers suggestions/ideas; good listener
- counsels when necessary

Cheerleader/Recruiter
- recruits teachers to serve as mentors or cooperating teachers
- has positive, enthusiastic attitude toward BEST and CT programs

Evaluator
- observed teaching formally
- makes informal class visits
- manages by waking around
- gives feedback
- writes formal evaluation

Backseat Observer
- entrusts supervision of novice teacher to mentor or cooperating teacher, yet is aware of what is happening
- serves as a neutral third-party

Mentor

- serves as a mentor, a guide to cooperating teacher or student student teacher

Supervisory Roles of Teacher Leaders

Enabler/Supporter
- be a confidant, friend
- develop an open, non-threatening, non-judgemental relationship
- offer emotional support

Inductor into School Culture
- orient novice ot school building and system
- provide basic information
- introduce novice to other staff
- explain certain rules and procedures

Coach/Critic
- offer specific suggestions on how to teach and manage classroom
- observe instruction and give constructive feedback
- prepare teacher to meet state competencies

Conflict-Resolver
- helps to resolve conflicts between novice and parents and other faculty

Evaluator
- write formal evaluation of novice

Findings By School

SCHOOL #1

A K-5 elementary school, this was the largest school in this study. It has 930 students, 65 certified teachers and about 65 other personnel, including two assistant principals. Located in a rural area, the school was even larger a year ago when it had grade 6 classes.

The school had two mentor-teachers. One was a first-grade teacher and the other, a kindergarten teacher. The researcher was only able to interview one of the beginning teachers who, in this case, taught kindergarten, although she did her student-teaching in the third grade. Her mentor was a first grade teacher. Although the school has had several student-teachers in previous semesters, there was only one this particular term. The cooperating teacher has had over 13 year's teaching experience: this was her second student-teacher. The student was in her second week of her second placement.

The principal, a female in her forties, has been a principal for 6 years, having served 3 years as an assistant principal.

Principal's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities to the Cooperating teacher and Student-teacher

The principal perceived herself as an evaluator of the cooperating teacher and student-teacher and as someone who monitors the cooperating teacher's work with the student-teacher. The cooperating-teacher agreed that the principal had evaluation responsibility, but also viewed the principal as an enabler. The student-teacher, who had limited contact with the principal, perceived the principal in the backseat observer role in terms of her supervision of the cooperating-teacher, but assuming the monitor coordinator and evaluator roles when supervising the student (See Table 1).

Table 1: Principal #1's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of her Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	Principal's Perception/Description of her Supervision of Student-teacher
Monitor-Coordinator •Evaluator	Monitor-Coordinator •Evaluator
Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	**Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Student-teacher**
Enabler •Evaluator	Enabler
Student-teacher's Perception of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	**Student-teacher's Perception of Principal's Supervision of Student-teacher**
Backseat-observer	•Evaluator Backseat-observer

Note. Indicates agreement between two parties or more.

As with other principals interviewed, this principal expressed strong confidence in the abilities of the cooperating teachers and mentor-teachers in her school. She formally evaluates the cooperating teachers whom she views as master teachers, implying that her evaluation is really pro forma. The direction of her supervision appeared to be in the area of supporting the work of cooperating teachers; for example, she: 1) meets with cooperating teachers to establish some informal guidelines to assist them in determining when to increase the student's teaching responsibilities; 2) she has round

table discussions with student-teachers on educational issues: 3) she observes the teaching of the student-teachers 4) at certain points, she brings cooperating teachers and student-teachers together for discussion and 5) she intervenes in difficult situations.

She was unwavering in her belief that student-teachers need to experience the full picture of the life of a teacher:

> I think my responsibility to the student teacher is very much the same as it is to a beginning teacher. I think it's real important that that person gets a good idea of what a school is all about...It sounds hard to say it, but I think it is a pressure cooker situation and I think it should remain a pressure cooker situation for a student teacher. I think they should see [teaching] in as a natural state as possible; what the role of a teacher is in this day and age. That it isn't 8:00 to 3:00 p.m.; that it isn't summers off... When you close a door and you have a classroom full of students, that's your main responsibility. But if you're going to be a teacher in this day and age, I think your responsibilities go way, way beyond that. So I want them to see how special education interacts with regular education, how PE and media and all those specials that we have impact a classroom. I want them to see what their professional responsibilities are: committees, and curriculum writing, and textbook adoption, and all that. So the student teachers in the building get involved in all of that.
>
> I have round table sessions with the student teachers also. They come up with the agenda. I say to them, "What would you like to hear?" They always want to hear about interviewing. They want to hear about special education. They're very interested in special education. So, they tell me that they want to do and two weeks from then, I get all the materials together and sometimes I bring people in and they can just ask a lot of questions. So they have found those sessions to be really valuable, I think. So I feel I have a lot of responsibility to a student teacher. I know

> who they are. I can write recommendations for them when they leave because I have observed them in the classrooms.

Her classroom observations of students include brief drop-in visits to writing formal observation reports, to conducting a total teaching assessment using the Connecticut Competencies and the State assessment process. She often writes letters of recommendation for students, has employed some of them later as substitute teachers, and in fact, hired two student-teachers for full-time positions.

The cooperating-teacher noted that, as there was only one student-teacher in the school this semester, the principal hadn't had any group meetings as in the past, but talked with her informally about the student's progress. She viewed her role with the student as helping that individual to become a good teacher (See Table 2).

She substantiated the principal's description of her responsibilities to student-teachers and the supervision of her which was conducted by an assistant principal. She found the principal to be particularly supportive in the previous semester when a personality conflict developed between herself and the student-teacher assigned to her. She describes the principal's intervention strategies:

> Well, she met with the student-teacher individually and the student unearthed all her problems and all her complaints and so forth. And then the principal met with me alone and told me some of the things that had been happening and then she met with the two of us together. And she tried to point out to the student teacher what some of the fallacies were in her thinking; that what she was observing was her own interpretation of things that were going on, rather than the factual things that were going on. So, I did find her extremely supportive...

The principal's contact with the university supervisor appeared to be for informational purposes except when problems develop. As the principal notes here, she expects the college supervisor to have greater contact with the cooperating teacher:

> The supervisors, I have found, have usually come in and met with me before they take over. We had a very difficult student-teacher / cooperating teacher situation last year where there was a tremendous amount of contact between myself and the college supervisor. It was a real, real tough situation. I have found, again, in the last 2 years, that they're very visible. They're here every single week. They're giving much better quality feedback to the student teachers and to the cooperating teachers. Of course, the bond is much tighter between the cooperating teacher and the supervisor and the student than it is with me. You come into the picture when there's maybe a problem? I come in kind of as an introductory thing. They want to get a feel for the school. They want to know how I prefer they operate and that kind of thing. And then, at the tail end, when they're done. But basically, the most interaction is between the cooperating teacher/student teacher and supervisor. And then, when there's a problem, the principal always gets involved. I think they're doing a much better job.

Cooperating-teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher

This cooperating-teacher, a real veteran, is also a learner who enjoys her work with students:

> I find that it's stimulating to me and it kind of keeps me more in tune with what is going on and makes me a little more innovative and a little bit more aware of what I'm doing or what I should be doing, because I'm trying to teach the students and I like to give new things to them. Yes, I find it a challenge, both for my own development and to help the students.

TABLE 2: Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Cooperating Teacher's Supervision • Enabler/Supporter Inductor into School Culture
Cooperating Teacher's Perception/Description of her Supervision • Coach/Critic
Student-teacher's Perception/Description of Supervision Received by Cooperating Teacher • Enabler/Supporter • Coach/Critic

Note. Indicates agreement between 2 parties or more.

The student-teacher, only in the second week of this placement, saw the cooperating-teacher as "a head teacher, teaching me to become the best teacher I can and to help me along the way,"; however, her perception of the principal's role(s) and responsibilites was rather limited:

> A lot of things are still foggy in my mind... but I just feel that the principal should check in once in a while to see how everything is going with the two of us. Because I really don't know what her responsibilities are with the cooperating and student teacher. I mean, I don't know what her job is. They really never explained it to me that this is the job of our principal when you are doing student-teaching here. So I can't say I expect her to do this and this. It would be just nice for her to come in and ask me how I'm doing things like that. But I'm not expecting her, because I know [the cooperating teacher] has been doing this for a while, and I'm assuming that she knows [my cooperating-teacher] has had a

> student teacher all these years and that everything has been running smoothly.... I'm not really sure, exactly, step by step, what this principal's role is because I know there's a lot of vice people, vice principals and all of that, so I guess they're working together making sure everything is going the way it should. Now I don't know whether [my cooperating-teacher] has meetings with her about my student-teaching because I think I'm the only student teacher this semester here...

At this point in her placement, the university supervisor appeared to be the key individual to the student. She appears to appreciate direct feedback from the cooperating-teacher and the college supervisor whom she refers to as the coordinator:

> Well, you know, what I want is really what I'm getting from my cooperating teacher. She's giving me feedback, telling me what I do wrong, what's good, what can be improved, which is what I need. And the coordinator (college supervisor) is telling me how it is going! She just sat in a lesson and told me the good and bad, so I can improve myself. We're all working really well together. I just feel it's going really well. I feel that she's concerned about what's happening with me and if there is a problem that I have with my cooperating teacher, I can tell my coordinator and then maybe things can be resolved, but there's never been really a major problem with that. But I just think the coordinating teacher is really showing a lot of involvement with me. You know, the seminar, coming and setting up an appointment at every seminar to meet the next time.

Principal's Supervisory Roles/Responsibilities to Mentor teachers and Beginning teachers.

From an examination of Table 3, it is clear that this principal evaluates the mentor teachers and the beginner and also monitors the status of the mentoring and the progress of the beginner.

According to the district contract, the principal is requested to do at least six observations per year of each new teacher; however, this principal indicated that she attempts to visit all classrooms each day. Frequent

Table 3: Principal #1's Supervision of Mentor Teachers and Beginning Teachers

Principal's Perception/Description of Supervision of Mentor Teacher	Principal's Perception/Description of Supervision of Beginning Teachers
• Monitor-Coordinator • Enabler • Evaluator	• Monitor-Coordinator • Enabler • Evaluator
Mentor-teacher's #1 Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Mentor Teacher	**Mentor-teacher's #1 Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Beginning Teacher**
• Monitor-Coordinator • Enabler • Evaluator	• Evaluator Backseat-Observer
Mentor Teacher #2's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Mentor Teacher	**Mentor Teacher #2's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Beginning Teacher**
• Monitor-Coordinator Backseat-Observer	• Evaluator
Beginning Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Mentor Teacher	**Beginning Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Beginning Teacher**
No Data	• Monitor-Coordinator Trainer • Enabler

Note. Indicates aggreement between 2 or more parties.

visitations enable her to obtain a broad perspective of a teacher's work and to gather data over time:

> I try to get into all of the classrooms each day, especially the beginning teachers. So you feel very comfortable talking about the changes you're seeing from week to week, the way the teacher is working with the children on an almost daily basis. So it isn't one of those situations where you come in and you see a problem and then you go to the teacher and you say, hey, I saw this and I didn't care for that, or something. They know that you've been in there and even when you go in and see them on a bad day, you can weigh that against a lot of other data that you have. So I try to get in there on a daily basis.

These drop-in visits may last for only a few minutes except when a teacher invites the principal to stay and/or to participate in a classroom activity. The principal believes that her presence in classrooms become something that is naturally expected by teachers and non-threatening.

Although tenured teachers require only 1 formal observation per year, this principal attempts to have contact with them on a regular basis. She explains:

> I still do pop in and out of the tenured teachers. They're the ones who come out in the hall and grab you when they see you go by because they've learned that you're not threatening. So they're constantly pulling you in and you become very, very often a big part of what's going on in their rooms. That is also true with the three administrators, all three of us are in and out. So they're used to that kind of thing.

She describes how she attempts to support mentor teachers:

> As far as supervising them in their role as mentor, I feel my role in that is support. Again, I'm not supervising what they're doing as a mentor. I'm trying to say to them, "I'm a resource. I'm here if you need me! If there's anything I can do to help, don't forget you have a half day you can take off during the year." I try to facilitate what it is that is going on. They [mentor and novice] say they would like to meet during prep time but it's going to go over the prep time, mayby I volunteer to go down and cover their classroom for a little while. If one of them wants to experiment with whole language, I'll say to them, "Gee, I know a wonderful whole language teacher in this school, why don't the two of you set up a half a day to go visit somebody else?" It's a very thin line between being supportive and knowing what's going on in that relationship to actually getting involved in it and trying to find out, you know, how do you think she's doing in this.

The principal indicated that she felt a great deal of responsibility toward beginning teachers, particularly since she hired them: however, her supervisory outlook and responsibility hasn't changed a great deal because of the BEST program. She describes her point of view this way.

> I see my role primarily, as far as supervision goes, to get in there, to form a very good relationship early on with the beginning teacher, to be very candid about what I see that's working and what I see that isn't working; but also offering the kind of help that it takes to make a beginning teacher, just somebody who is out to help. I guess because I hire the people, I feel a great deal of ownership toward them...And that's been the same before and after the BEST program. ... The role of the building principal is to ensure that person's success in the building and if you can't ensure their success, if it just turns out to be a situation where they cannot be successful, then helping them make another choice, and ... helping them come out of the experience okay.

In addition to drop-in supervisory visits and formal observations, this principal has established a beginning teachers' support group designed to meet her goal of ensuring their success. She describes the activity of this group:

> I have another thing that I do that isn't part of the [district's] policy. We have beginning teachers' meetings about once every two weeks, at the beginning of the year, just to make sure that they're up to speed. Say, when the first parent conference comes, we've already done a meeting on parent-conferences and I've shared information with them on how to organize the parent conferences. Open house - what are some ideas you can use to get ready for open house. So we try and I ask teachers from the building to volunteer for that committee so that they can actually bring in letters and show teachers things that they have done, samples of lesson plans, that whole kind of thing. It's called beginning teachers' committee. And we have teachers who volunteer and I usually chair it. And we set up an agenda and they come in and share information with the beginning teachers...

Data-coders were in agreement that the beginning-teacher interviewed perceived the principal as an <u>enabler</u>, particularly by making herself available to the novice and through the beginning teachers' monthly meetings. In addition to discussing report-card issues, open-house, and other major school events, the novice pointed out that the principal also discussed the school evaluation procedure and the State competencies and how the State assessment system works.

The beginner described the principal's support this way:

> Well, for one, she makes herself available at all times. Her door is always open and oftentimes it's so hard to schedule meetings, etc. If I'm in the office and I need to say, "Gee, I have this problem or whatever," she'll address it right there.... For example,

> if I want to go visit another classroom or whatever, she'll see to it that there's no problem, they'll provide the substitute time. I've never been rejected once in asking for anything like that. And also I was able to go to a conference concerning kindergartens and it is absolutely wonderful. I had a whole day off, and it was a very, very, positive thing.

In discussing the principal's formal observations of her teaching, she substantiated the principal's description of the candid way in which she provides feedback:

> Well, basically when she comes in, you know, she will just watch what is happening. She doesn't really get into interacting with the children... She stays about 50 minutes to an hour and she can see the goings on. And in the beginning of the year, she said to me, "You know, I think perhaps a little more structure would be a good thing." She knows I'm the type of teacher that I want structure but I'm very much into cooperative learning and all that structure. So that was the suggestion she made to me like week 2, so I got that structure down and I have children moving in these cooperative groups, etc., and she came in and she saw that and was pleased to see that things are working well.
>
> Then she did the evaluation within a day...so it wasn't up in the air. I didn't think, oh gee, did I do well? Did I not do well? I felt as though I did well. You kind of know in your heart. But you still need somebody to come in and point out things. And oftentimes, I think in the beginning you almost don't even know what you're doing right. You're doing a lot of things right, and you don't even know it. She pointed out many things that were going on in the room, and she was pleased...

Both mentor teachers found the principal supportive in terms of their work with beginners, particularly in providing mentors and mentees with time to meet. One mentor was particularly pleased that she felt free enough to discuss any problems with the principal. The other mentor defined support as lack of interference from the principal:

> Well, mostly, support in the sense, that she doesn't interfere. She lets us have the time off that we need. We have a sub anytime that we want to take a half day to work with our teachers. I guess the state provides a half day. This is mandated by the State. So I don't think she could refuse us, but we have been allowed without any problems to do that. Now, as far as other support, she has really pretty much stayed out of the picture. I have had no discussion with her about the program at all this year.

This mentor indicated that one group meeting for mentors was held at the beginning of the year. Two others were scheduled but had to be cancelled at the last minute. She has had little contact with the principal this year and is formally evaluated by the assistant principal.

The other mentor was formally evaluated by the principal who also made informal visits to her classroom to see what the children were doing, however, she expressed a desire to have the principal come to her classroom more often. She hypothesized that because she was a veteran teacher, the principal probably didn't see a need for frequent visitations. The principal's openness and willingness to listen was appreciated by this mentor:

> She listens to my ideas. I can come in and sit down at this table with her and she will listen to my ideas, she may say, no, at first. And, she has often thought about something I have said and gotten back to me and said, listen, I've though about it more, I agree, let's try something. So she doesn't always cut you right off. She is very willing to listen to you.

Mentor Teachers Supervision of Beginning Teachers

All parties were in agreement that mentor #1 served in a coach/critic role. The beginning-teacher and mentor-teacher also perceived the mentor-teacher's supervision to be enabling (See Table 4).

Table 4: Mentor-teacher #1's Supervision of Beginning-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Mentor-teacher's Supervision
• Coach/Critic
Mentor-teacher #1's Perception/Description of her Supervision of Beginner
• Enabler/Supporter • Coach/Critic
Beginning-teacher's Perception/Description of Supervision Received
• Enabler/Supporter • Coach/Critic

• indicates agreement between 2 parties or more

Preparing the novice for the State assessment and offering emotional support to the beginner were two aspects of her supervision described by mentor #1. She sees herself in a role that is less authoritative than the principal's;

> Well, I'm more or less the mentee's support system. I'm there for her to complain if she wants to. I'm there for her to just let me know when she's having any kind of problem that she might not be able to deal with. I think the principal goes in and sees her in a different role. She feels that when the principal comes into her classroom, she had better be ready and she had better be on her toes. And it's almost as though she's performing for her. And when I go in, I go in more or less as a friend. And, I don't want to use the word "critical," but I'm not as critical probably as the principal would be...I'm someone who can help her iron out problems that she may be having in the classroom with planning, with her students, with a useable lesson.

Like mentor-teacher #1, mentor-teacher #2 also perceived herself to be a coach/critic (See Table 5).

Providing feedback to the novice is an important aspect of mentor #2's supervision:

> I see myself there as a support in the sense... I've gone in and observed her classroom and worked out and discussed ways of doing things that would be more helpful; just kind of helping get some things out that she feels that she is having trouble with and making suggestions that sort of thing. So I feel that it's my job to kind of listen to her and use my expertise that I've gotten over the years and learned the hard way; to share some of my experiences with her, so that she can try to iron things out.

Table 5: Mentor-teacher #2's Supervision of Beginning-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Both Mentor-teachers and Supervision
* Coach-Critic
Mentor-teacher's #2's Perception/Description of her Supervision of Beginner
Enabler/Supporter * Coach/Critic
Beginning-teacher's Perception/Description of Supervision Recieved
Was not interviewed

* indicates agreements between two parties or more

This beginning teacher of kindergarten believes that having a mentor who is a first-grade teacher actually proved to be an advantage as the mentor offered her a great deal of insight about the progress of kindergarten children and what her expectations are for first grade.

The novice found that her relationships with her mentor slowly developed and that her mentor was helpful in assisting her to organize her class and providing her with basic information:

> In the beginning, it was perhaps a little more formal because we just had to kind of get to know each other. And, we planned to meet at least once a week...Wednesday, at such and such a time. The first time we met, she said, "Well, is there anything that you want to bring up?" But at the beginning, there are so many questions, I just don't even know what they are...And what she did is she helped me to get on track. Like, for example, setting up a substitute folder. That is a very essential thing to do. I mean, God forbid, if you get stuck on the highway, or you're lost, or whatever, you need that. And what the substitute folder did for me, also, is it helped me to organize. This is what I do, this is why I do this. OK, fine. So right from the beginning, I prepared and I got that thing together.
>
> She helped me, for example, with questions that I had about the developmental readiness of children and this whole thing. She pointed me in the right direction. Here's some excellent literature; here are things that perhaps may help you. A lot of Louise Bates Ames, all those books. So that helped me to understand am I looking at the right things in my children. She comes into my room. At this point she'll come into my room, you know, just to say hi, but it's really kind of to check things out and I know that, and that's fine.
>
> She got right on the ball as far as let's go in, look at another classroom. You come in and visit me. So right there...within the first month of school, I had a date set up where I went and visited other kindergartens within our building, and I visited her class. And that way, I could see that my structure is fine. It made me feel more confident that, gosh, I do have the right structure to my day, or I do have a workable structure...And other people are doing this, so that's a good sign, that veteran teachers are doing basically the same things that I was thinking.

> She helped me to do whatever I'm doing, better. When they did their calendar, there's a lot of incidental learning that comes into play.
>
> And I think also in the beginning, you're somewhat intimidated that you hold fast to your lesson plan and you're kind of scared of the situation. She helped me to be myself, have that confidence...and trust yourself and throw in that incidental learning learning and go with it. And there'll be a lot more verbal exchange between you and the children and that's what she helped me do right at the beginning.

Somewhat uncomfortable with having another adult in the classroom, the full-time kindergarten aide, the beginner used the mentor to learn how to deal with the aide. She explained:

> But, you know, I found her a great deal of help and support because in the kindergarten, I also have a full-time aide, and even dealing with your aide in a positive way can be difficult, and I really needed support looking at that picture as well. So not only do I have to deal with these children, but now I have a person in my room all the time. And although I'm sure the person wasn't sitting there evaluating my every move, the person has been in the school system for 18 years, and here I am, a new teacher, and that really intimidated me in the beginning. Even though I'm sure that she only wants to support me, but I need to see that and feel that and know that. And this particualr individual, my mentor, helped me to see that this person is not a threat; this person is there and they're going to help you to do the best you can.

<u>Sharing of Supervision between Principal and Teacher Leaders:</u>

According to the data-coders, participants' perceptions of the sharing of supervision varied. Mentor-teacher #1 and the cooperating teacher described some sharing, while mentor-teacher #2 indicated that little sharing of supervision of the novice took place between her and the principal.

Both the principal and mentor-teachers share supervisory responsibility; however, as the principal points out, because of the need for confidentiality, they don't exchange information obtained from their observations:

> We shared supervision because we're both in there and we're both basically looking for the same kinds of things. We're both working with the competencies and helping to bring that person's level of competency up. I guess I see it as very separate. The mentor teacher goes in when he or she can go in and works with what they see with the beginning teacher. I'm doing exactly the same kind of thing...they don't share with me what they see and what problems they see and what positive things they see. We don't really discuss our findings of a supervisory nature.

If there was a serious problem with the novice's teaching, the principal would handle it through supervision the way she normally does. She would discuss the problem with the teacher and suggest that the teacher select a course of action for resolving the issue: either by using the principal for assistance; by working with the monitor, or by joint discussion of the situation among the three parties.

> ...The beginning teacher owns the information. So only if the beginning teacher sees the need for the three of us to sit down and talk about a problem would that really happen. I wouldn't call the two of them together to discuss a problem. So, the kind of supervisory things I'm doing is kind of paralleling what the mentor person is doing.

Mentor-teacher #1 reported that the principal advised her to maintain confidentially with the beginner. Mentor #2 explained that her mentor is evaluated by the district's special education coordinator; not the principal; however, it is her understanding from the training she received that it is the option of the novice to discuss the results of any evaluation with her.

The beginning teacher appeared to perceive her relationship with the principal to be more formal and official than her relationship with her mentor and distinguished between them as to the nature of supervision sought from each:

> ...I think my mentor is more my confidante, and although what I say to her, I would probably say to my principal given the opportunity, I don't feel as though she has time to hear me pour out my heart... And it's more a business relationship. It's a good relationship. My mentor, I could cry on her shoulder.... I can talk about a student, my worries about a particular student, and really brainstorm with her for a period of time. Whereas I don't think that my perincipal, that's not our relationship. Her relationship with me is... to see that everything is going well... With my mentor, she and I would talk and brainstorm [to determine] our plan of attack for the next month or whatever. Then we get that together and say, "Well, I think that I need to observe one more time, or I'd like you to come in more," and than we go to the principal and say, "We need a date for observation."

The principal believes that in the final analysis, she and the State assessment team have the power to make major decisions regarding the beginning teacher's future: however, it is the novice's responsibilitity to share the feedback received from the assesament team and the principal so that progress can be made.

Effect on Principal's Role and Principal's Affect on Programs

The BEST and CT program increase the amount of paperwork the principal is required to complete and the principal's accountability; however this principal feels supported and better understood as a result of these programs:

> ...I guess I would have to say that I feel more supported in my efforts to make somebody successful or to help make somebody successful. I feel that there are people out there who are sharing my job to a certain extent and that makes me feel good. I feel

> better understood because they go into a classroom with someone and they see that there's a problem and they see that it's not easy to work with an adult to try to correct the situation... The paperwork and that kind of thing is minimal compared to the feeling that I have that I'm not along and that somebody is beginning to understand the role of an administrator...

She also believes that her enthusiasm and endorsement of the programs has had a positive impact on them and the school as well:

> The teachers who are the mentors are sharing their experiences; the doors are opening up and down the hallways. The student-teachers are welcomed and the student-teachers and the beginning teachers are welcomed into almost every single classroom in this building. And people are just real positive about helping others get accustomed to their job in a school setting.

Both mentors believe that the BEST program relieves the principal of some supervisory responsibility, "takes the principal off the hook", particularly since the mentor can assist the novice in strenghtening any deficiencies which the principal might discover, a task which in the past was left to the principal or not done at all.

The beginning teacher, wishing the principal would visit more often but somewhat sympathic to the principal's overall job responsibilities given the size of the school, substantiated the principal's description of her support of the BEST program, viewing the principal as a resource person, a link with the latest developments in the State. She explains:

> ...Everybody in this school is fairly knowledgeable. We know what's going on in the State and I really feel as though our principal is our resource person. I would love to sit and read Kappan and read all these excellent magazines and literature on education at this time. I simply do not have the time.... I can't go to all these meetings and all that kind of stuff, so she is an outside resource person. She has taken that job, brought all this information to us so everybody in our school is very knowledge-

> able about what is going on in the state. So right there I think there's a certain pride; we want to be part of excellence in education and I think everybody feels that way. Just that positive support right there has done a lot to facilitate the success of the program. Just that she's knowledgeable...believes very strongly in the program and... has a lot invested in this...

The Best and the CT programs have also caused a restructuring of the roles of principal. "Unlike the boss 10 or 15 years ago, "the principal commented," they know where the buck is going to stop. They know where the decision is going to be made, but as far as I'm concerned, the mentor program and the cooperating teacher program has helped share that ownership a bit!"

School Improvement

The principal perceives the BEST and the CT programs as empowering for teachers as it enables them to play a major role in the training and credentialing of colleagues. It gives them ownership of the quality of work which goes on in the classroom next door to them, and in so doing, has a positive effect on the school climate.

The cooperating teacher saw her progam as benefiting the school as it enabled them to hire teachers who proved they have potential while in the student-teaching role. Also, she was pleased that expectations of teachers are now made clear:

> ...I think the expectations are much higher, plus we're aware of the expectations. When I first started teaching, I was just on my own. I was given the books, the manuals, and left to sink or swim. I first started teaching in a school that had a supervising principal and she had her own 8th grade class, so she never had twice during the year. But there was really no one to help if I felt I was floundering, if I felt that I was having a problem: there really wasn't anyone other than another teacher to help. Whereas now, I think between the

> mentors and principals, who I think are more trained for supervision, I think that it's much more helpful to the beginning teacher, but much more demanding, too.

Another program benefit noted by one of the mentors is the sharing of ideas that takes place between the novice and mentor which enriches the mentor and other teachers as well.

The BEST and CT programs have helped to spark the school staff which the principal finds very rewarding as she describes below:

> I mentioned before, I feel they understand my job a little bit more. I trust them a lot more. I'm watching them grow in these jobs and it's wonderful to watch them. When they start feeling secure in that area, then they start being willing to put in the time necessary to research curriculum issues. We just did a major reading adoption here and I was so proud of the teachers and the way they handled that whole process.
>
> They know darn well that if there's a big problem, I'm going to say," This is what it's going to be, but to be able to sit back and watch them handle it as professionally as they did, and come to the right decision, was wonderful. I tease them. I say, "It's just wonderful to sit here and listen to you and I'm still getting paid the big bucks." They laugh. It's just really nice and you don't feel alone. And the other thing is, it's not just a clique. It's not just a few people. They're really expanding and...you're really able to start to see the strengths of all of them as individuals and there are a lot of them here to be trying to watch and everything. It's just been very, very positive.

Recommendations

There were three recommendations made by program participants:

1) that the State continue to keep in touch and listen to the cooperating teachers and mentor teachers in order that quality follow-up training sessions can be planned:

2) that the principal of this particular school remove extra requirements such as committeework for beginning teachers so that they could devote all of their energies to their classrooms in the first year; and

3) the beginning teacher expressed a desire to have a mentor who taught at the same grade level and who was located in a classroom that was in close proximity to the beginner's.

School #2

With an enrollment of 235, grades pre-K to 5, school #2 is small, located in a community near one of the state's largest cities. There are 10 full-time teachers as well as physical education, music, art, speech, Chapter 1, and learning disabilities specialists. The district has over 3,000 students and is experiencing a population resurgence.

The school has one pair of CT program participants. The cooperating teacher has 17 year's teaching experience. She teaches kindergarten and has been at this school for 6 years. The student-teacher is a senior who has been in this school for two weeks, her second student-teaching experience. Although there are three teachers who have been trained to be mentors, the school has no new teachers. The principal has 14 years experience in that role; however, has served in this school for only 2 years.

Principal's Supervisory Roles/Responsibilities to the Cooperating Teacher and Student-Teacher

This principal perceived his supervision of the cooperating teacher more broadly than either the cooperating teacher's or student-teacher's view of his supervision of the cooperating teacher. In terms of the identified categories, all three parties saw the principal as taking on the monitor-coordinator role when supervising the cooperating teacher,

while the cooperating teacher and the principal were in agreement that he was both enabler and monitor-coordinator. The principal, however, also perceived himself to be a trainer and backseat observer (See Table 6).

Table 6: Principal #2's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of his Supervision of Cooperating-Teacher	Principal's Perception/Description Supervision of Student-teacher
•Monitor-Coordinator Trainer •Enabler Backseat Observer	•Enabler
Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating-Teacher	**Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Student-teacher**
•Monitor-Coordinator •Enabler	Backseat Observer
Student-Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating-Teacher	**Student-Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Student-teacher**
•Monitor-Coordinator	•Enabler Evaluator

• indicates agreement between 2 of more parties.

The principal does not believe his supervisory responsibilities to the cooperating teacher to be greatly different than his responsibilities to all teachers. He believes that he has an obligation to provide all teachers with a positive, professional environment in which to work.

> It is my strong belief, that if they are happy and content and feel good about everything, then their professional output will be commensurate with their morale. To reduce it to simple terms, I like to try to respect everyone as much as I can, keep them happy, and it shows in their productivity....

He conducts formal supervisory observations of the cooperating-teacher and makes frequent informal visits to her classroom to observe and offer praise and support. As he notes:

> Whatever their specific needs are with regard to the cooperating teacher and student teacher relationship, anything that they ask of me I try to accommodate them. But with regard to any specific design, I don't have anything other than what I'm doing with my general staff anyway, who recognize we have a very good rapport and relationship morale-wise, and they recognize...my efforts to try to help them grow as much as I possibly can, which I feel is one of my prime functions.... If they have any needs, I try to meet them.

The principal also indicated that when necessary, he intervenes to ensure that the relationship among the various adults in a classroom is functioning smoothly. He explained that this particular classroom also has a part-time aide, in addition to the student-teacher, who had a philosophical difference with the cooperating-teacher. He met with both parties to assist them in settling their differences.

The cooperating teacher seemed to appreciate his presence and the fact that she could count on him in difficult situations with parents, colleagues, or the university supervisor. The student-teacher believed that the principal's responsibility to the cooperating teacher and to her was to keep a watchful eye to ensure that the cooperating teacher is doing her job as a teacher-trainer.

> I feel that he does have a responsibility to the cooperating teacher and to myself and to the [college] supervisor to observe us, to check up on us, to see how things are going, to make sure that everything is going well. Also, at the University, with my supervisor, at the end of my student teaching experience, I have to evaluate him, but what they don't do is provide an evaluation for us to evaluate the cooperating teacher. And I think that that would be the principal's role, to make sure that the teacher is doing her job and training efficiently... Supervisors get evaluated, but the cooperating teachers don't. And I think it's up to the principal to make sure that everything is going well,..., that we're both doing our jobs, that I'm learning things, you know, the competencies that I should, and that the teacher is letting me fulfill those competencies that I should for the state. So, a lot of times, the teachers are just left and the classroom door is closed, and I think that it should be open a little so the principal can make sure that everything is being done the way it should be.

Both principal and student-teacher agreed that he assumed the enabler role when supervising her: however, the cooperating teacher described him as a backseat observer in terms of his supervision of the student-teacher. The principal explains how he supports the student-teacher:

> And I pretty much leave the ongoing, daily supervision of the student-teacher to the cooperating teacher,... but I try to make her comfortable, professionally comfortable, and feel a part of our family, so in effect, that is a supervisory function....

> So I bring her into all of our extra programs. For example, we have presentations which I can show you, a bulletin board with pictures on it, puppet shows, and anti-drug and alcohol shows, police department, the fire department, community safety. I always include her, and if she happens to be operating the class at the time, I address her as if she were the teacher, and I accord that respect which she apparently is very happy about. So we include her in on everything and we have here a Ferrara All-Star program, and the teachers get to select each week a student, not related to academic progress or achievement, but just generally being a good person and good student. If they're a good helper or a good listener or they have tried particularly hard, or have helped a classmate in some way, they're noted as the Ferrara All-Star and I take their picture, take a certificate down to their room and we put it on the bulletin board. So, I'm making the student-teacher have some input in this as she gets to know the students.

He goes on to say that whenever he visits the student-teacher's classroom, he makes a point of observing her work and commenting on it.

Understanding that the principal cannot be present to observe each of the student-teacher's lessons, according to the coders, the cooperating teacher believes that he demonstrates <u>enabling</u> and <u>monitoring</u> behaviors by touching base with them, by helping the student to feel comfortable, and by his willingness to serve as a mediator if any problems develop:

> He's very supportive as far as if I had any problem with the supervisor. He intervenes with the supervisor at the college level. First of all, I haven't had that, but he is right there, and he has said to me several times that "if you do have a problem I will certainly intervene and contact the person or whoever is in charge." He has been very supportive also with the student as far as for recommendations. At the end of the term, he will come in and talk to the student and take them and go over their time with me and if it

> has been very positive, he will ask me. If he feels a recommendation is needed, he will write one according to basically my input on the situation. But he has been very supportive that way. So we do have a good rapport and good contact. It's not like he never sees my student, she never sees him, or vice versa, or I don't have any contact. It's kind of like a triangle, where we do talk to one another, and he will at times take my student, talk to her, and say "how are things going," "do you need any help in certain areas?" So, it's not a one-way street, it's been a triangle, and this is how I feel it should be. We should be getting the cooperation on both sides of the coin. Not only should she get it from me, but she should get this input as well.

Although in the school for a very short time, the student-teacher substantiated the principal's overall supervisory thrust of establishing a positive school climate where each individual is respected. She describes her contacts with him:

> the first day when I came here, he took the time to greet me at the door and to walk me down to cooperating teacher's room. He introduced himself and he said he was very happy to have me and hoped I had a good time here, and enjoy my stay. And, I've seen him every day, he has invited me into his office to talk with me and he's very nice. He's very caring and concerned about my stay here. But he's very supportive and he's very concerned about individuals in the school, and the children, mostly. He has an all-star program, where he takes their pictures and gives them an award. He displays lots of the art work along the school. He really makes everyone feel important in the school, and I thought it was nice that he took the time to talk to me and welcome me.

Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of the Student-teacher

Based on the judgment of data coders, all three parties agreed that the cooperating-teacher served in a coach/critic supervisory role to the student-teacher. The principal and the cooperating-teacher, however, saw the cooperating-teacher as an enabler/supporter as well. The cooperating teacher also described himself as an evaluator of the student-teacher. (See Table 7).

Table 7: Cooperating-Teacher's Supervision of Student-Teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Cooperating Teacher's Supervision
*Enabler/Supporter
*Coach/Critic
Evaluator

Student-Teacher's Perception of Cooperating-Teacher's Supervision
*Coach/Critic

Cooperating teachers Perception/Description of Her/His Supervisor
*Coach/Critic
*Enabler/Supporter
Evaluator

The cooperating-teacher makes a point of reviewing the Connecticut Competencies with the student-teacher and indicates in which areas improvement is needed. She also spends a great deal of time conferring with the student to foster her professional development.

> I mean, it's a lot of hard work for both parties: for the student and the cooperating teacher, and you spend many, many hours. It's not like you spend a half hour. We come early in the morning and we're talking before school, we're talking at lunch time, we're talking and trying to make the program work for both people, making it better; some things work, some things don't work.

Sharing of Supervision

There was disagreement among coders as to the extent to which this cooperating teacher and principal share supervisory responsibility of the student-teacher. Both principal and teacher agreed that the cooperating-teacher has the primary responsibility for supervising the student-teacher; however, this principal certainly appeared to take a pro-active stance in working with both of them. The principal did view himself as sharing the supervising of the student. The cooperating-teacher believes that, given his total responsibility, the principal is involved to the extent possible. She points out:

> Basically, I do have the bulk of the responsibility, as far as evaluating her, writing an evaluation, and my daily observations. I really have the bulk of it. I mean, he will ask me, but basically, he will go by what I have said, my input. Not that he hasn't seen, but he doesn't have that much time to spend, okay. So I do give the bulk of it. I'd say 85-90%. He, of course, in daily operations sees how she is carrying on with her duties and responsibilities. And if he sees it going smoothly, then he is assuming again that everything is going according to the way it should be, unless I say otherwise. But basically, I do have the bulk of say in her evaluation, because I am with her every day, for the full school day, both sessions and categories. You know, it is a little bit harder for him in his supervisory position to have a lot of input. But he is definitely aware, and I think he is giving us as much as he possibly could.

Effect on Principal's Role and Principal's Affect on Program

The principal believes that the school's participation in the CT program has not affected his role greatly, other than the fact that he makes an extra effort to make the student-teacher feel a part of the faculty. On the other hand, he indicated that his attitude, his desire to help the staff and student-teacher to feel important and worthy helps to create a positive feeling among staff toward the CT program.

The cooperating-teacher concurred that his positive enthusiastic attitude toward having student-teachers in the school helps the student to gain in self-confidence. She also believes that because of the CT program, that the principal is more aware of the teacher's about responsibility to a student-teacher. She notes:

> Also, it makes him more aware that he has to be on top of the situation in case a problem should arise. That this is his school, and basically, ultimately, he is responsible. Even though I have the bulk of it right now, if there were to be some kind of a situation that would arise, he ultimately would have to deal with it. So he has to be very aware of what is happening. He just can't say "oh, fine, we have a student teacher." He has to really kind of know what is going on. And that, of course, comes with our conversing back and forth, and I keep him informed of what we do weekly. On a daily basis, it is virtually impossible. But weekly, I do try to update him, which I feel is important. His awareness and knowledge of the situation helps him to gain a greater understanding and appreciation of the cooperating teacher's role and the time it takes to train a student.

Although this school did not have a mentor and novice teacher working together at this time, this principal briefly discussed the assessment and evaluation of the beginning teacher, particularly the

possibility of the state assessment team arising at a difficult conclusion regarding a beginning teacher's competencies than the principal. He does not believe that the beginning teacher is overly - evaluated and sees both processes as being employed in a postive way - to build on a teacher's strength. However, because of a principal's personal, ongoing and informal contact with a beginning teacher over time, and formally evaluating the beginner. The principal develops an intimate knowledge, in an intimidate kind of a teacher's strengths and weaknesses. He would not be able to accept a contrary judgment about a beginning teacher from a state assessment team.

School Improvement

Both principal and cooperating teacher saw the BEST and CT programs as improving their school and upgrading the profession in general.

This principal participated in state-wide assessor training to learn how to use the Connecticut Competency Instrument to assess beginning teachers, a part of the BEST program. For him, this experience was one of the most meaningful, professional development experiences.

As a result, he has had 10-12 brief sessions with his staff in which he has trained them to use of the Connecticut Competency Instrument. He believes that the competencies provide principal and teachers with a common language for conversing about teaching and what he called "a professional outlook shared among teachers." Also, the competencies are being incorporated into the town-wide teacher evaluation instrument and processes.

> One thing that the BEST program has done for me, not only the mentor aspect, but the assessor aspect, is to become very familiar and knowledgeable about the teacher competencies, the indicators that show good education. So, although we all knew...by nature and experience in past years what was good and what wasn't and

> what worked and what didn't, this gives it a structure...to fall back on and it also acts sort of like a professionally reflective mirror for experienced teachers...now with this structure, they can see how each behavior will fit under an indicator, a proficiency, and they'll see how they're building a very proficient atmosphere to teach and for students to learn. So I use the program as sort of a structure and a guideline to refer to, and to reiterate and to mirror their good teaching methods and wherever they need assistance, they receive it. So with their open reception of my little training....they are now more conversant with the language and the indicators, and the defining attributes of each.

He believes that by using the Competency Instrument with teachers and also the skills of conferring he acquired during the training program, that he can help very good teachers to go beyond their present high level of quality teaching.

The cooperating teacher saw her involvement in the CT program as a way for her to learn more and to maintain a level of teaching excellence. She believes that she obtains new and innovative ways to teach from the student-teacher and that the intensity which this program requires helps to keep her to be top-notch professional which greatly benefits children.

As an aside, the cooperating teacher pointed out that the Educational Enhancement Act has increased teacher accountability as well as the paperwork, and has increased opportunities for teachers to meet with colleagues, "You realize you're not alone in this, that people are feeling the same thing." Also, the State training for cooperating teachers helped her to break out of a routine and to keep abreast of developments in the profession, and to continue to grow in the profession.

Recommendation of All Three Parties:

Cooperating Teacher

1. Principals should undergo the same kind of training which was required of cooperating-teachers. She also suggested that perhaps principals and cooperating-teachers from the same school participate in this training together.
2. She expressed concern about the range in quality of supervision of student-teachers from participating colleges. She would like the State to define the roles of cooperating-teacher and college supervisor so that both parties know what is expected of each other.

Principal's Recommendation

1. Maintain the excellent level of assessor training.
2. Take extreme care and caution in selecting mentors and assessors. He believes that less than qualified individuals in these positions could undermine the BEST program.
3. The state should devise a brief training program, perhaps a half-day in the summer regarding the Cooperating-Teacher Program. The session would involve large and small group interaction and would include principals, cooperating-teachers, and perhaps potential student teachers. The purpose to it would be to gain knowledge, awareness and sensitivity to each other's roles and responsibilities.

School #3

Situated in a rural community, this school has 450 students in grades K-12. Although there was a slight drop in student enrollment at the secondary levels, elementary school enrollment is increasing district-wide. Within several years, officials expect the total enrollment to be close to 1,300 students.

There are 54 teachers in this middle/high school. The principal has been head of the school for 5 years, after having served for 6 years as assistant principal in another school. He is also the district coordinator for the BEST and CT program.

The school has one pair of teachers in the BEST program and a teacher and student-teacher in the CT Program.

Principal's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities to the Mentor Teacher and Beginning Teacher

Both principal and mentor teacher were in agreement that the principal assumed the role of evaluator: however, the principal perceived himself to be a monitor/coordinator and cheerleader/recruiter as well. The mentor teacher also saw him as a role model and backseat observer (See Table 8).

Table 8: Principal #3's Supervision of Mentor Teacher and Beginning Teacher

Principal's Perception/ Description of his Supervision of Mentor Teacher	Principal's Perception/ Description of his Supervision of Beginning Teacher
Monitor-Coordinator Cheerleader/Recruiter * Evaluator	* Evaluator
Mentor Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Mentor Teacher	**Beginning Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Beginning Teacher**
Role-Model Backseat Observer * Evaluator	Monitor/Coordinator Enabler * Evaluator
Beginning Teachers Perception/ Description of Principals Supervision of Mentor Teacher	**Mentor teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Beginning Teacher**
No Data	* Evaluator Backseat Obaerver

*indicates agreement between 2 or more participants

The principal described three aspects to his role as monitor/coordinator: 1) to place beginning teachers with mentor teachers within the school; 2) to check to see that meetings are taking place between the two individuals; and 3) to informally assess the mentoring process regarding the frequency of the mentor's visits to the beginning teacher's classroom, the nature of feedback the mentor teacher is providing, and to obtain an overall picture of the situation.

Data coders concurred that this principal also viewed himself to be a cheerleader/recruiter as a result of his encouragement of staff to participate in the BEST program. The principal believes that by recruiting teachers for the program, he is in effect sanctioning the program, affecting it in a positive way.

Lastly, as the mentor teacher is a tenured teacher, he formally evaluates her according to the district contract: however; not as frequently as non-tenured teachers. He indicated, though, that he visits her classroom often, as he does with all teachers. During formal observations, the approaches he takes vary, depending on a teacher's subject area and experience.

The mentor teacher has had 8 year's teaching experiences. She started her career in this school. Completing the summer BEST training, she agreed to support the only new teacher hired.

In thinking about the principal's supervision of her, she describes his formal and informal approaches:

> Well, the formal part he has to do his ....one formal evaluation for tenure, and I'm tenured. And...his style (is that) he always walks around the building, every day, and he will walk in and out of my class....every once in a while, in and out of my class casually, for maybe 5 minutes, 10 minutes. If there's something unusual going on in the classroom, he'll sit around and watch. He does that all year long. That's about what I see...his supervisory role to be. He's just in and out of my classroom, and then just that formal evaluation.

She also mentioned that the principal has, throughout the year, asked how her work with the beginning teacher was proceeding and offered suggestions when appropriate. This cooperating teacher perceived him to be very helpful and supportive in this respect.

Unlike other mentors and cooperating teachers interviewed by the researcher, this mentor teacher appeared to model some of the principal's supervisory behavior when she worked with the beginning teacher.

> Maybe it's his personality that I admire. It's easy-going but when something has to be done, or when something has to be said, he says it and you know that he means what he says. I try that. I like that and I try that with [the beginner]. It can be real informal, and we can just talk a lot about nothing, but when I've got something to say, I've got to come out and tell him what I think. For example, after an observation we get together and talk about it. If there's something that I want to tell him, maybe it's about the kids in particular, or about discipline, I will start out with, "Well how did you think it went?" I give him an opportunity to say it. And then I will bring it up, "Well didn't you think that this wasn't right?" Even if he says no, then I'll tell him that that would drive me crazy and I think maybe you should put a better hold on them, and I take my chances.... I'm not a supervisor. I'm there and he can take what I say, and do with it what he wants but I think that it works. And I see [the principal] operate in that manner. He's kind, but yet when he tells you something, he does it in a way that's not harsh. You wouldn't take it the wrong way. You would respect his opinion. And I think that hopefully I can do that.

In terms of her work with the beginning teacher, this mentor viewed the principal as a neutral third party whose role is to provide support to her when needed. By doing her job, she in effect assists and supports the principal with his supervisory responsibilities.

> I know what I have to do, and [the beginning teacher] should know what's expected of him. And I think that the principal would just have to be there for that support. I don't think that he can tell me what to do, how to approach

> things, because I think I've learned that in my training, and hopefully the beginning teacher has learned in his training so far what to do.... So I think, as far as the mentor program, he takes, maybe a backseat, a third party.... Because he has his own job to do, and I think that, hopefully, I'm helping his job. When he has to go in there and formally observe that beginning teacher, hopefully he sees something that he's happy with. And that's because of the beginning teacher, of course, what he's learned, but also me helping him.

A music teacher, the beginning-teacher teaches chorus, musical theatre, and offers voice lessons. He had the fortune of working as a substitute teacher in this school for five weeks at the end of last year to replace the music teacher who was on maternity leave. His mentor teacher is a member of the business education department.

The principal described himself to be an evaluator of this new teacher. The mentor teacher and the beginner also perceived the principal's supervision to be evaluative. The beginner, also saw him as a monitor/coordinator and enabler, while the mentor teacher viewed the principal as a backseat observer, as was noted earlier.

This particular principal places a high priority on supervision. He indicated that he spent a great deal of time in classrooms on an informal basis. This was corroborated by all teachers interviewed. In addition to his informal supervision, he must fulfill the district-wide policy of formally evaluating new teachers twice during the school year. He describes his supervision of all teachers and a new teacher this way:

> As I would do with any teacher, but particularly with a first year teacher, I'm in the classroom quite a bit and I do, frankly, a lot of informal visits in the beginning so that I'm in and out, five minutes, ten minutes, seeing a variety of different classes, trying to hit different periods and different levels... I also do formal observations ... and in those I'll try out different techniques. I will script tape for some classes, and other times, take notes or use an interaction analysis system, or anything I think needs to be handled, depending on the situation, depending on the kind of classes, and depending on what the teacher thinks. Many times, I'll ask the teacher, "What do you want me to look for? Is there a particular problem area that you want some feedback on?" For example, if it's "I only have three kids participating," then I may take a look at a Flander's interaction analysis to show the teacher what's happening and together we can come up with some suggestions that involve these things. So it depends on the needs of the teacher, but I do formal observations.

The beginning teacher was appreciative of the principal's classroom visits, yet somewhat surprised:

> ... it strikes me as being unique that he'll walk around into classrooms and make sure everything is going OK, just sit down at the other end of the class and watch what's going on. I think that's very interesting, because I didn't expect that a principal would do that. Every once in a while, he'll just pop into the classroom just walk through or he'll stay for a few minutes. He sat in and observed a few of the classes full length, but most of the time it's just walking through. He comes to all the concerts that we give, so he can give me feedback that way. It's not too often that I'll come in here and ask him for help on a certain thing, because I can usually ask other people, and I know that he has a lot of other stuff to do. But he gives me a little encouragement here and there, just a few words and its kind of nice.

Mentor Teacher's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities

In distinguishing between her supervisory responsibilities to the beginning teachers and the principal's supervising responsibilities, this mentor teacher indicated that she sees herself as a helper, as someone who provides emotional support to the beginner, as well as specific teaching suggestions. In her view, the principals responsibility to the beginner is to conduct formal summative evaluations.

There was no agreement among the three parties as to the nature of the mentor teacher's supervision of the beginning teacher. According to data coders, the principal perceived the mentor teacher to be a coach/critic. While the mentor-teacher described herself as an enabler/supporter and conflict/resolver. The beginning teacher viewed her primarily as an enabler and conflict-resolver (See Table 9).

Table 9: Mentor's Teacher Supervision of Beginning Teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Mentor Teacher's Supervision	Coach/Critic
Mentor Teacher's Perception/Description of His/Her Supervision	• Enabler/Supporter • Conflict Resolver
Beginning Teacher's Perception/Description of Mentor Teacher	• Enabler/Supporter • Conflict Resolver

Note. Indicates agreement by at least 2 parties.

In distinguishing between his and the mentor teacher's supervision of the beginner, the principal reveals that his evaluation responsibility limits the openness in his relationship with the novice and restricts the extent of his enabling behaviors. As he states below, the mentor is able to fill this gap:

> ... I'm the one who signs an evaluation. A mentor is much more supportive. While I consider myself a supportive person, I'm still the person's evaluator. But I think there's much more openness that occurs with the mentor teacher. I think it's the mentor's responsibility to be in the classroom, to offer suggestions and hints in the classroom, but I think the key factor is adjustment, learning the ropes, things that your principal never tells you, things that you can't cover in a faculty meeting. All the survival skills that are necessary that don't come from principals or any administrator, because number 1, you don't have the time to do that intensive kind of situation on one-to-one where the mentor does have that responsibility of clarifying issues, procedures as well as classroom, helpful hints and feedback.
>
> In addition, I think the other responsibility of the mentor is to prep the person for the state assessment. To go through that process so that the person is ready to deal with people coming in from the outside and just taking that snapshot of your class. I think that's a significant role that a mentor has to play: getting them ready either through script-taping or going through the entire supervisory process, the assessment process, and going through the assessment guidelines, so that person is ready and knows what exactly is going to happen when those people come in.

The mentor teacher describes the principal as an <u>evaluator</u> of the beginner while she is very clear that her role is to offer emotional support:

> Well, I think that he [the principal] is, of course, more responsible for the evaluative method, going in and writing his evaluations. Even though I've gone in and done observations, none of my observations are put on paper. ...I play more of the role of helping out [the novice] more emotionally, than telling him or giving him suggestions of how to teach something....that I think that I'm there for this particular mentee for emotional support with kids, discipline. [The principal] will go in whenever he does his observations...and then gives him his suggestions and writes up a formal observation. But I see [the novice] at least once or twice a week, and I think I hear more of what goes on in there and can give him help as far as with the kids, not so much with the curriculum because we're in two separate areas.

As she teaches a different subject-area than her mentee, she explains that assistance with the teaching of music had to come from another individual:

> ...I'm in business and [the mentee] is in music. When we first started out the year [the mentee] was here for I believe a month and a half last year. So when he came back this year, he still had to have a mentor.... He had gotten his feet wet, but he needed more answers to questions that had to do with music, and how to teach music, and I couldn't fill that role. I could only give him suggestions where he could go to get that information. I think he got a lot of that from his department head, who is not placed in the building here. She's down at the elementary school. She comes up once a week. I think she was able to help with some of those things.

This example illustrates a limitation of assigning mentors to mentees who are in different fields of specialization.

This mentor teacher offers some specific examples of how she provided emotional support to the beginner and the importance of the confidentiality of their relationship:

> ...This year he had a little run-in with someone in the department, and when it happened, he didn't know what to do... And he came to me, "what should I do? I know I did this... but what should I do?" And it was an upsetting experience. He was able to come to me and let it out when it first happened. That's where I came in. At least I could tell him, "Why don't you go see this person, and why don't you tell the principal, talk this over with him," and he didn't have to do it. If the mentor happened to be in his department, the other person, he couldn't have gone to anybody. That made me pretty happy that he actually came to me, because he knew I wouldn't tell anybody anything, because everything that we have is confidential, too.
>
> In the very beginning, when he didn't know how to handle discipline with a particular student, he would come to me and ask for suggestions. Another thing that happened this year,...one student started hanging around a lot. He became, I think, like a mentor to the student and he didn't know if that was proper or not. He didn't know how close he should get to the student. So I helped him out there a little bit. He didn't know where the line should be drawn. I can see that, because I remember that, too, when I first started. So I gave him some help there too.

The beginner teacher explained that he sought information about the school from his mentor, as well as help with respect to discipline problems, but he did not depend on her for suggestions about teaching music as she was in another field. He also visited her classroom to observe her teaching.

He also substantiated the mentor teacher's comments when he described the emotional support the mentor teacher provided him as well as assistance solving particular problems:

> Now, if there's a problem, I'll go to her, and I'll say, how do I solve this problem? I was having some problems getting along with the band director and one time it got really bad

> and I didn't want to come and ask the principal about it... But I went to her and I talked to her about it and it made me feel a little better. And she said, "Well go and talk to the [Principal]. And I said, "Well, all right, I'll talk to him." And then I did and that seemed to solve everything. But it seemed like if things get really bad or something, at least, in the back of my mind, there's somebody that I can go and talk to. That's kind of nice!

The beginning teacher distinguishes between the type of help and support he seeks from the principal and from the mentor. As illustrated in this example, he is more likely to seek informal advice from the mentor and discuss a problem with the principal when it reaches a more official, formal level:

> Well, I could imagine instances where I would need to come to the principal and not to my mentor. If there was a problem with a parent, ... then I would use the principal. I think ... the relationship between the mentor and me is, I don't know, it's kind of casual, so I can go in there and talk to her and ask her things on a, I don't know, more of a laid-back kind of level.
>
> I go to [my] mentor more about things, like, you know, "Today was really rough!" Here's an instance - I had a musical that we were doing in a musical theater and it got to be really hectic finding an accompanist and the accompanist that I got never worked out. One of them that I really planned on just kept on showing up late for the rehearsals and not showing up to make a tape and all sorts of stuff. It got really bad. Well, every once in a while, I'd pop in and I'd say, this went on, this went on! So she got the idea over a long period of time that it wasn't working out. After a while, I just said I'm going to cancel this production because it's not going to work out. So she understood. Now, [the principal], I didn't tell him all the little things along the way, but I would tell him, you know, I'm going to cancel the production just because that's it. He should know that, but not necessarily all the little things that led up to it.

Principal's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities to the Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher

Although data-coders could not agree on how this principal perceives his supervision of the cooperating-teacher, both principal and cooperating-teacher believe that he does monitor the student-teacher's progress. He states that it is his responsibility to ensure that the person to which the student is assigned is well-qualified and that the placement is working for the cooperating-teacher as well as for the student.

Table 10: Principal #3's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/ Description of Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	Principal's Perception/ Description of Supervision of Student-teacher
No Agreement	* Monitor-coordinator
Cooperating Teachers Perception/Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	**Cooperating Teachers Perception/Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher**
Role-model Evaluator Backseat / Observer	* Monitor-coordinator Backseat / Observer
Student-teacher's Perception/Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating-teacher	**Student-teacher's Perception/Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating-teacher**
No agreement	Enabler

Note. Indicates agreement between 2 or more parties.

In describing his supervision of the cooperating-teacher, he notes that cooperating-teachers are tenured and have been evaluated frequently. He would not recommend an individual to the district-wide selection Committee unless he/she was an excellent teacher. He states:

> ...that would be a tenured teacher who's been through a lot of evaluation processes and supervision, and I want to make sure that that person is quality, to give direction and model appropriate teaching behaviors. So that's the kind of supervision that I would do there. I wouldn't want someone training with a lemon, and if there's a bad situation, they wouldn't get to the committee as far as I'm concerned. They could apply, but they wouldn't have my endorsement.

He makes a point of observing student-teachers and providing them with feed-back:

> I ask every student teacher to invite me in for a class after they have established a comfort level, and they're ready to have an outsider come in and view their teaching. I do that for a variety of reasons. One, so that the student teacher gets feedback from an administrator in addition to the cooperating teacher or a university supervisor, because the reality is they're going to be supervised and evaluated when they get a job by an administrator. So I think that's good. I also think that in the future, if necessary, I could write a reference based on my observations for that person. And also for my benefit, should a vacancy occur here, I've seen what that person can do and not do. So there's a personal thing for me in doing that. But my role is much more limited with a student teacher than it is with a mentor/ mentee relationship.

His role is different, he believes, because the mentee is his employee, while the student-teacher is not. His obligation is to make sure the placement is successful and that the student is getting all of the training which is necessary. Providing young pre-service teachers with an opportunity to train in a very nice school is the extent of his

obligation to them while with beginning teachers, he has contractual obligations to be certain that that person is performing and is ultimately responsibility for them...

It is interesting to note that like the mentor teacher, the cooperating-teacher in this school, models the principal's supervisory behavior when she works with the novice. She describes his supervision of her this way:

> He'll come into the room and he doesn't schedule an evaluation time with you. He would rather see what's it really like in your class? Let's not schedule a day when you're going to pull your, what we call your cart and pony show out, and show me you best, which may not be the way you really are each day. So, he'll pop in for 5 or 10 minutes, see what the kids are doing, and leave. And I've talked with him about that, and he said that he thinks that he can get a real taste of the atmosphere in the classroom, the relationship between the teacher and the students, and get a truer picture of what it's really like than scheduling an evaluation.

In this particular situation, a departmentalized organization in a secondary school, the student-teacher actually has two cooperating-teachers. The student works in two rooms which are adjoining. This cooperating-teacher then, models the principal supervisory style, frequently dropping in to the adjoining classroom for 10-15 intervals to see how things are going with the student teacher.

The student-teacher reported that her interaction with the principal was informal. She was pleased that when she was initially assigned to the school, the principal knew her name and welcomed her. She also liked the idea of the principal observing one of her classes. As she describes here, the student-teacher perceives the principal as someone who should intervene when necessary:

> I think he should just be there if you need additional help or if there is a problem between the student-teacher and the cooperating teacher, which there hasn't been. I haven't come across anything unusual, I don't think, or any problems. I would think the principal should step in at that point, whether it be classroom problems or dealing with other teachers on the staff. I would just say, "Treat a student-teacher just as you would a regular teacher!"

Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of the Student-teacher

Both cooperating teacher and principal agreed that the cooperating-teacher served as a coach-critic to the student-teacher. Data-coders could not determine the student-teacher's perception of the supervision received by the cooperating-teacher (See Table 11).

Table 11: Cooperating-teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Cooperating-teacher's Supervision	* Coach-Critic
Cooperating-Teacher's Perception/Description of his/her Supervision	* Coach-Critic
Student-teacher's Perception/Description of Cooperating-Teacher's Supervision	Not Enough Data

* indicates agreement between 2 or more participants

The principal placed the responsibility for the initial certification of the pre-service teachers with the college supervisor. As noted earlier, he sees the cooperating-teacher as someone who is to give direction to the student and to model appropriate teaching behaviors.

Sharing of Supervision Between Principal and Teacher Leaders

In this case, data-coders indicated that the mentor teacher did not perceive that there was a conscious, planned sharing of supervision of the beginning teacher between herself and the principal: however, both principal and the beginning teacher believed that such a sharing did exist in practice, although it was not part of a formal supervisory plan.

The principal talked about his and the mentor teacher's supervisory responsibilities:

> We don't get into a three-way dialogue or anything of that nature. I'll just check to make sure that everything is going okay, any problem areas. And I do that with the mentee as well as the mentor. I don't think I violate any confidentiality and we don't discuss specifics, but I get a general trend that everything is either, yeah, ok, things are going well, or maybe I better get in there more often.
>
> Mine [supervisory responsibility] is general I guess. I'm looking at all the teachers particularly beginning and non-tenured teachers, where the mentor is focused. Other than that, sometimes our roles duplicate, I assume. But that's OK, because the more supervision, the more feedback, the more dialogue that occurs, you're better off as teachers. But as far as, do we plan out supervision and who's going to do what, when, where, why, how? The answer is no.

Data-coders judged that the cooperating-teacher did not perceive that she shared the supervision of the student-teacher with the

principal. Data-coders also in concurred that the principal did not view himself as formally dividing any supervisory responsibility for the student-teacher with the cooperating-teacher.

The cooperating-teacher perceived the principal's role to be that of an overseer, to be there for support if needed. In deacribing the principal's role, she states:

> ...to sort of oversee. Just like he does with the rest of the faculty. And of course, if we had a problem with her, we would come to him, and say, gee, this really isn't working out. I feel enough support from him that I would do that if I felt it was necessary.

She does not deem it necessary for herself, the principal, and the student-teachers to get together occasionally for three-way conferences:

> I don't see a need for it, really. With three of us working with her, that's plenty. I think he trusts what we're doing. Now he may not feel that way about every department in this school, I don't know. But he knows the three of us well enough to know. And he trusts what we say.

In comparing her roles and responsibilities to the principal's, the cooperating-teacher saw herself as having more direct contact with the university, with the obligation to complete the paperwork which the college requires:

> Well, we have all sorts of forms from the University of Connecticut that we have to fill out, evaluating her. [The principal] doesn't have to do that, as far as I know. So I almost feel like ours [cooperating-teacher's] is a little more formal an evaluation, while he [the principal] has to keep an eye on things and make sure things are going all right, but he'll take whatever we say. Because we're the ones

> who have to document everything. We're the ones who have to fill out these. Every week there's an evaluation, and then there's a four-week, eight-week, twelve-week observation that has to be filled out.

Effect on Principal's Role and Principal's Affect on Programs

This principal believes that the BEST and CT programs have no effect on his role as principal, but do impact on his role as district facilitator. He pointed out that some colleges and universities are not going through the process of contacting district facilitators to place students. As a result, he discovered that there were several student teachers in his district of which he was not aware. As a result, he never distributed the pay vouchers owed to cooperating-teachers. His role as district facilitator does take time away from his job as principal.

His attitude does, however, have a positive affect on both programs. He explained his impact this way:

> I think by my attitude toward it. I have a very positive attitude. I've seen it work with people. I know it will continue to work and I know it's a terrific support system and I think that's a major role. Once people know that they have administrative support to do these kinds of things, I think it kind of opens doors. I also have an effect by encouraging people to apply. I'm not afraid to go up to a teacher and say, "Hey, I really think you'd be great in this kind of role, why don't you consider submitting an application to the district committee?" So, encouraging people. First of all, the core training helps even a veteran teacher. The feedback. I've been through it, myself, but I also have gotten feedback from everyone who's been trained in this area, an they say it's excellent. So I think it's an eye opener for even the most veteran teacher.

> And I also think it gives them a boost. They feel good. You stay in the classroom 20 years, you get tired and you need some incentive, and I think this is an incentive program. They can help other people. They're good, they know they're good, they can get out there and help younger teachers. I think it's a very positive attitude builder.

He also offered some examples of the nature of his support of program partiacipants, which included counseling a beginning-teacher out of the profession:

> Support takes a variety of different forms; support can be just verbal, like, I think this is a great program, and people respond to that - well, the boss says it's OK, so this has got to be something that I should maybe look at or be interested in; support in the sense of a new teacher maybe having some difficulty and support sometimes when things aren't going well, if there's a communication problem and we need to iron a couple of things out, support occurs that way.
>
> So I guess it can be a positive and negative support system. For example, I don't want to emphasize the negative, but last year we had a first year teacher and I suggested that he resign. And the mentor said to me, I think that's a wise suggestion. So there's a lot of support going in all different directions. We had gone through all the support. We had gone through all the suggestions and this person wasn't receptive, wasn't hearing what the mentor was saying, wasn't hearing what I was saying as an administrator, and wasn't happy with his own performance, and packed it in. So, I understand that that person is working somewhere else right now, too. I think that's important too. You have to know call some shots on someone.

The cooperating-teacher perceived the principal as someone who embraces change and who is 100% behind the school's involvement in the CT program. The mentor teacher believes that the principal definitely has an effect on the success of the BEST and CT programs. Unlike the

cooperating-teacher who viewed the CT program as increasing the responsibility of the principal, the mentor teacher noted that the BEST program makes the principal's job easier. The mentor teacher explains how her work assists the principal and lightens his responsibilities:

> When he has to step in and do his observations, hopefully, it has made his job a little bit easier and the beginning teacher is better prepared when the principal goes in to observe him. I think that if the mentor wasn't there to help the beginning teacher out on how to maybe run a class, or how to write lesson plans, the principal would have to step in there and help him out or the beginning teacher wouldn't get any help at all. So let's say the beginning teacher did need some help in certain areas, it would be up to the principal to find help for him or give it to him himself. I don't know if he would really have to do that. But with us stepping in there, at least the principal doesn't have to worry about that, because we're there to give the beginning teacher that experience, or help them out, give them that aid, that maybe the principal would have to do if maybe we weren't there.
>
> I think that I would have liked that if I was a beginning teacher. To know that there was one person that I could go to, and it wouldn't be my principal. Because I think a beginning teacher would be very apprehensive about going to their principal and asking them every time they needed help with something. I don't think I would have done that. Depending on the principal. Our principal is very often open to that, but they're not all like that. And the beginning teacher does not want to seem incompetent. By coming to a cooperating teacher or by coming to a mentor, I don't think they feel stupid about doing that.

The mentor-teacher believes that the principal's encouragement and openness raises the quality of her relationship with the beginning teacher. The fact that he recruits volunteers for the program and shows interest in it conveys a positive value toward it among teachers.

School Improvement

The principal, mentor-teacher and cooperating-teacher believe that the BEST and CT programs improve the quality of education offered in their school.

Both cooperating-teacher and mentor-teacher expressed regret that they did not have this kind of support when they began their careers. The cooperating teacher was particularly pleased with the training received and the structure which the CT program provides. She comments:

> Well, I think that it makes the cooperating-teacher and the student-teacher better teachers. You're improving instruction to your students. As a cooperating teacher, I found one of the hardest things is to let go and let her take my class. Because I will sit in there and I will see her make mistakes and I will say. "Oh no." But you have to let them make mistakes. So I think the quality of the education that the kids are getting is better since this program has begun. Keeping the student teacher or the mentee more on track and not letting them get way off before they are corrected. Because it's so structured and you have to meet with them and you have to evaluate. You have to discuss. It didn't used to be that way.

While acknowledging that the BEST and CT Programs have not become part of a formal plan for school improvement, this principal believes that both programs strengthen the quality of teaching:

> Obviously, we have an overall plan for improvement and this is we really stress excellence and set a major goal in raising expectations. ... I haven't thought it through in the sense of "Let's integrate BEST or cooperating teacher into this goal." But I think it does, because as we're improving the quality of instruction and delivery services, it does affect overall school improvement. We're working to make our teachers in the beginning of their career as strong and as forward looking that they

> possibly can be. So it does, I haven't formalized it; it's not in any great goals; it's not in any mission statement, but it's there. It's there as a practical approach to improving instruction.

Recommendations by all Parties.

1. The principal strongly endorsed the notion of principal's being included in the core and assessment training provided by the state, at least in an abbreviated version. He suggested that the training be voluntary and that it be done by role group, that is, principals trained seperately from the teachers. He specifically noted that skills of conferring and observing instruction should be part of this training program.

2. The mentor teachers suggested that the level one mentor training needed to be revised and felt that plans were already underway to make recommended changes. She also suggested that the principal, mentor, and mentee get together several times a year for a general discussion about the progress all are making.

3. As was mentioned earlier, this beginning teacher of music was assigned a mentor who was in a different discipline. Although, recognizing that there might be some difficulty in finding mentors in special subject areas, he still preferred to have a mentor in his field as he discovered some limitations in his present arrangement: for example, he was not able to obtain specific instructional suggestions, i.e. how to teach students to sing in two parts, from his mentor who was a business teacher.

School #4

School #1 is located in a rural/suburban community. It has an enrollment of 470 pupils in grades K-6 and is part of a district of 4500 students. There are 22 full-time teachers plus 2 part-time teachers who are responsible for a kingergarten session each.

Although this was the first year that the school had participated in the BEST and CT programs, the principal indicated than an informal approach to supporting beginning teachers had existed, with seasoned teacher serving as mentors to beginners; however, there have been few new teachers hired in this school during the past eight years.

Although the school had two pairs of program participants, a beginning teacher and mentor and a student-teacher and cooperating teacher, the researcher was only able to interview the student teacher and cooperating teacher, as well as the principal: however, the principal did discuss his supervision of the mentor teacher.

The principal, a male in his mid-forties, has been in his present role for eight years. The cooperating teacher has 2 years' teaching experience while the student-teacher was in her third week of her second student-teaching placement.

Principal's Supervisory Roles / Responsibilities to the Mentor Teacher and Beginning Teacher

Interview coders agreed that this principal perceived himself to be a trainer, a role model, an enabler, a cheerleader/recruiter, and mentor to the mentor teacher and an enabler, evaluator and mentor to the beginning teacher (See Table 12).

Table 12: Principal #4's Supervision of Mentor Teacher and Beginning Teachers

Principal's Perception/Description Supervisors Roles/Responsibilities to the Mentor Teacher	Principal #1 Perception/Description of his Roles/Responsibilities to the Beginning Teacher
Trainer	Enabler
Role Model	Evaluator
Enabler	Mentor
Cheerleader/Recruiter	
Evaluator	
Mentor	

Even before this school became involved with the BEST program, this principal asked experienced teachers to assist and guide beginners. That practice (cheerleader/recruiter) has continued, although with some modifications as he notes:

> ...the way it worked before it was a formal program was not radically different from the way it exists now that it is being sanctioned by the State. I would suspect that the mentors are probably able to do a better job because they have been through a formal training session. And yet my role in that is not significantly different. In the past, I would go to a teacher and say, "Would you please work as a mentor with the beginning teacher? I did the same thing this fall. The only difference was that rather than relying strictly on my own judgment and that this person would be a good mentor, I was restricted, because I had two people in the building who were trained and those were the only people I could turn to. But with that restriction aside, I went to the teacher and I said, "Would you serve as a mentor for this beginning teacher?," and because the person had been through the training, she was ready and waiting and glad to have somebody.

Although the coders viewed this principal as a trainer of mentors, this role was not very extensive and was rather informal, consisting of providing mentor(s) with an article to read about mentors and talking about it. Also, the data coders, interpreted this principal's supervisoy behavior with all teachers, particularly during conferences, as behavior which mentors could emulate when working with novices. As the researcher was not able to interview the mentor teacher, one cannot verify whether this modeling actually took place.

The principal described himself as an enabler, mentor and evaluator to both the mentor teacher and beginner.

He viewed himself as a mentor to a few teachers in the school, a relationship which has developed naturally, probably because of the peronsal chemistry between himself and these individuals. In some respects, it is an informal relationship which borders on friendship, yet it is professional. He is an informal mentor to certain teachers who may or may not be participating in BEST or CT programs.

This principal makes some interesting observations about the mentoring role and his evaluation responsibilities.

> So, I am responsible for supervising both the mentor teachers and the beginning teachers. That role is oftentimes judgmental. It's evaluative, that's part of the evaluation process. That's not the role of a mentor. A mentor's role is to be helpful and there may be times when the mentor needs to make suggestions and to offer some criticism in a constructive, encouraging way. That's a definite distinction between a supervisor and a mentor. Because supervisor's role by its very nature can be somewhat threatening and intimidating if there's a problem or a weakness.

Although he recognized that the evaluation he does is oftentimes positive, encouraging, and helpful "all those things that a mentor's relationship can and should be," he points to another side of the evaluation process.

> ...Which is, it can be threatening to teachers. It can be perceived as negative for ... and here we're a weakness, if there's a teacher who is performing up to standards, not performing as well as he or should be, then your presence in the classroom raises their level of concern. There's always that uncertainity that insecurity is ever present among the best teachers, who are so diligent and conscientious, they don't recognize how good they are.

The principal describes his supervisory responsibility to the mentor teacher and to the beginning teachers.

> My supervisory role is in some ways very clear and precise. A non-tenured teacher is observed 5 times a year and I will do anywhere from 3 to 5 of those. The department chairman will do one, the assistant superintendent will do one; I will do perhaps 3. And in some cases, I will do all 5. For a mentor teacher, who be definition, has to be tenured, I will observe once a year, and practically speaking, the observation is very informal. In some cases, I don't even see them formally to write up an observation. So that's a distinction between the two. I would assume, and I can say this in the case of the two mentor teachers we have, they are excellent people. They are people who require very little supervision, who are hard working and self motivated. But beginning teachers, I keep a little closer eye on, make sure I get in to visit and see more frequently. So there's a difference in the level of supervision and the nature of the supervision between a mentor and a beginning teacher, part of that is a system requirement.

In addition to differences in the number of formal evaluations and the length of classroom observations this principal made of the beginning teacher and mentor teacher, another distinction in his supervision of these two individuals is the content of the discussion of supervisory conferences. When conferring with beginners, he makes an effort to get to know them personally and he shares information about himself and his expectations in addition to talking about teaching and children. As mentor teachers and principals know each other well, they already have developed a relationship and know each other's styles and expectations.

The principal also indicated that he was pleased to share supervisory responsibilty of the beginning teacher with the mentor teacher. He does not believe that his authority or influence is being diminished, but that his position is actually enhanced.

In thinking about the ways in which he and the mentor teacher work with the novice teacher, he suggested that the initiator of the supervisory contact will vary.

> I'm thinking that the beginning teacher is probably going to initiate a lot of the contact between herself and the mentor teacher. There are occasions when the mentor teacher is going to reach out and initiate. I think that the beginning teacher will request information and ask questions of the mentor and me as well. Between the principal and the beginning teacher, the initiation might be more from my hand through observation; I make it a point to comment, tell her how great it was and thank her. Maybe I'll write a letter to her next week if I have a minute. A lot of that tends to be more initiated from me.

Principal's Supervision of Cooperating-Teachers and Student-Teachers

There was agreement among the coders that this principal views himself as a monitor/coordinator and enabler in terms of his supervision of the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher, however, describes him as an enabler, evaluator and backseat observer. There is agreement between the cooperating teacher and principal that the principal takes on an enabling role. There was not enough data to determine the student teacher's perception of the principal's supervision of the cooperating teacher.

For example, while acknowledging that his role and responsibility to the student teacher is limited, the principal indicated that he "touched base" with the cooperating teacher on a regular basis so that he was aware of the status of the student-teacher's development. Initially, he had set-up a three-way conference between himself, the cooperating teacher and the student in which they discussed her background and experience and the classroom. He talks frequently with the college supervisor, depending on who is supervising and his relationship with that person, and he did an informal observation of the student and praised her for her work.

The cooperating teacher describes his "enabling" behavior:

> I find (the Principal) very supportive in terms of both being a cooperating teacher and a regular classroom teacher. He is supportive in terms of any problems that arise or whatever. I certainly feel free that I can go to him and he would help me sort it out if I needed that. In terms of the evaluations, the student I have right now is the second one I've had this year. I had a student in the fall as well. Before I did a final evaluation, the finalized copy, I had him read it and give his feedback in terms of was I accurate, was I too critical or not critical enough, because the fall was the first time that I had filled out the new instrument. I would say he certainly is not necessarily in the room observing, but he knows exactly what is going on, because he is in and out a lot, and I think you can pick up just the tone, whether you should be in more, just from being in and out.....

She also concurs with the principal that his role in supervising the student is limited.

> I would say that I have most of the responsibility for the student teacher. I've been fortunate that there haven't been any problems with the two that I've had under this cooperating teacher program. Certainly, if I felt there was a major problem, and that I'm really responsible for my class, and that a quality education is not being offered by the student teacher, if I felt this was happening, certainly (the principal) is the one person I'd go to. I think probably the supervisor from the college has more real control over the student than the principal here. I would see him (the principal) more as a support to me than being the direct supervisor of the student-teacher.....

Although the student-teacher viewed the principal as supportive, primarily because he welcomed her to the school, she did not elaborate as to the nature of this support and appeared to have little conception of the principal's role.

Table 12

Table 12: Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher and Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	Principal's Perception/Description Supervision of Student Teacher
Monitor/Coordinator	Monitor/Coordinator
*Enabler	*Enabler
Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	**Cooperating Teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Student Teacher**
*Enabler Evaluator Backseat Observer	Backseat Observer
Student-teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Cooperating Teacher	**Student-teacher's Perception/ Description of Principal's Supervision of Student Teacher**
Not Enough Data	*Enabler

* indicates agreement between 2 or more parties

Cooperating Teacher's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities

There was no agreement among coders as to how this principal perceived the cooperating teacher's supervison of the student-teacher. The cooperating teacher and the student-teacher concurred that the cooperating teacher was a coach/critic; however the student-teacher also viewed the cooperating-teacher as an evaluator.

Table 13

Table 13: Cooperating-teacher's Supervision of Student-teacher

Principal's Perception/Description of Cooperating teacher's Supervision of Student teacher	Student-Teacher's Perception/Description of Cooperating Teacher's Supervision of Student teacher	Cooperating-teacher's Perception/Description of his/her Supervision of Student-teacher
No Agreement	* Coach/Critic Evaluator	* Coach/Critic

* indicates agreement between 2 or more parties.

The cooperating teacher expressed a need for greater cooperation and communication between the college and the school. She believes additional guidance from the college as to its expectations, i.e., the type of lesson plans it requires, would be helpful. Although the cooperating teacher sees the principal as supportive, believes the principal has an effect on the Cooperating Teacher Program, she did not point to any factors which would prevent a sharing of the supervision of the student teacher with the principal. She recommends that principals be in the Best and CT programs and receive some of the training in which she participated.

Principal's Attitudes, Concerns, and Recommendations

This principal views the BEST and CT programs in a very positive light. He believes that both of these programs provide him with relief and assistance.

Although he continues to do the matching and pairing of novices to teacher leaders, the job is easier as mentor and cooperating teachers are trained and anticipate this involvement in assisting others to develop professionally.

He concurs with the cooperating teacher in that principals need more information about these programs and should be included more in plans and activities related to them. He noted that district facilitators who work directly with the programs can unintentionally leave principals out of communication and decision making processes: for example, principals know teachers well and should be consulted regarding the selection of cooperating teachers and mentors.

> It should be designed so that it includes the principal in one capacity or another, so that the principal knows what is going on and is involved in at least some level of the decision-making and determination about the people who are participants and how it's all conducted. We're the leaders and we can't do that when we're uninformed and when we're uninvolved. That's the key.

The principal also suggested that the issue of the relationships between the state assessment of the beginning teacher and the district's evaluation of the beginning teacher needs to be addressed. Differences in ratings between the two assessment/evaluation procedures could lead to contractual or legal complications. The fact that discussions between mentor teachers and beginning teachers are confidential was not perceived as troublesome by him. He compared such confidential, private discussions with those that go on in the teacher's room all the time and did not feel a need to know about them.

<u>School Improvement</u>

Both principal and cooperating teachers believe that the BEST and CT program will improve the quality of teaching but do not see them as directly connected to a specific plan for the improvement of their school.

The principal describes what he believes the effects of these programs to be:

> I think that a benefit, an outcome of the two programs is a focus on deliberate systematic development of new emerging professionals, whether at the training stage or at the beginning stages. It's much less haphazard now than it was before. Before, there was no formal training; there was no stipend, no coordination or supervision. It was a little loosley-coupled than the system we have operating now. I think that that coordination is healthy and helpful. I guess it's, as you look at it as a puzzle, it's one of those pieces that fits, and as you try to build a better instructional system, a better educational system, you really have to make sure to attend to all of the parts that contribute to that teacher training and the supervision of student teachers. And once they've entered the system and become part of the school, you want to still maintain the development. And then all the way through, professional development takes over, the new evaluation program becomes part of that. Increasing teachers' salaries is a piece. They all fit together, they're all interlinked and if you remove one of them, it really weakens the whole system.

Focus Group Findings

The first part of the focus group discussion dealt with the principal's supervisory roles and responsibilities in relation to the BEST program. During the second hour, the discussion was centered on the Cooperating Teacher Program.

The Best Program

A. Recruiting Teacher Leaders and Sanctioning Their Involvement

There appeared to be a consensus among focus group participants that a critical role for the principal or other administrator is to encourage teachers to become involved in these programs. The quality of the supervision already in place in a school will affect the selection process of teacher leaders. Principals who know their staff members, who are knowledgeable about adult learning, will more likely be able to identify those teachers who are learners and teachers of adults and entice and encourage them to take active leadership roles.

Focus group members believe that the principals attitude toward the BEST and CT programs is critical to their success. One of his/her key roles is to legitimize the involvement of teachers as mentors and cooperating teachers so that individuals serving in these new roles will not be ostrasized by their peers.

B. Supervising (Supporting) Mentor Teachers and Novices

Focus group members were in agreement that principals need to legitimize the involvement of teachers in very practical terms by providing substitute coverage for mentors and beginners and by allowing for flexibility in their teaching schedules so they can confer and observe each other teaching and by helping them to have access to resources (information, materials, and

people). They also viewed the principal as key to establishing a school climate whereby mentors, novices, and other teachers are comfortable talking with each other about instruction.

There was some debate, however, among discussants over the extent and degree of the principal's direct involvment with the mentoring process. One principal, for example, described how she "got the ball rolling" between mentor teacher and novice by setting up a three-way conference among them and laying out an agenda that should be addressed during the first few months of the school year: open house, report cards, parent-teacher conferences, the new math program, etc. These 3-way meetings were followed by conferences between mentor and principal to assess the progress mentor and beginner were making.

This example raised a number of questions: To what extent should principals step in to show mentors the way? Would mentors, who believe that working with mentees is their responsibility, resent this type of interference, direction, or support from principals? Does it represent shared supervision between mentor and principal?

C. Confidentiality and Accountability

A decision was made early on by State policy-makers that mentors would be required, to keep confidential, information obtained as a result of their work with beginning teachers. Although mentee's may discuss their problems and concerns with principals and other colleagues, mentors may not share information gained about the novice's teaching with others.

Some focus group participants questioned whether there can be a true sharing of supervision between principal and mentor if the mentor maintains confidentiality. The principal is the individual who is accountable for the novice's performance to parents and others. Where there are concerns about a

beginning teacher's performance, should the principal raise the concerns to the mentor or to the mentee? Wouldn't the sanctity of the mentor/mentee relationship be broached if the principal frequently brought concerns to the mentor teacher?

A suggestion was made that an appropriate way for the principal to handle difficult situations and yet support the notion of confidentiality is to carry out instructional supervision by working directly with the novice. The new teacher may then raise concerns discussed between him/herself and the principal with the mentor and use the mentor as a resource to solve the problem. In this way, confidentiality is maintained, the mentor-mentee relationship is respected, and the beginning teacher is in charge, as he/she owns the information and can decide what to do with it.

D. The Mentors and the Principal's Roles

Some focus group participants viewed the mentor as an "extension" of the principalship; others did not, as such an interpretation might prevent novices from sharing the results of state assessments or concerns about principals' evaluations with mentors.

There appeared to be agreement that the presence of a mentor does not eliminate the principal's supervisory responsibility, although it may ease that responsibility somewhat. It was pointed out that it is important for the principal not to convey the feeling to the mentor that s/he is "dumping off" the principal's work to the mentor.

Participants agreed that it is the responsibility of the mentor to assist the novice to improve his/her performance, but not to participate in decisions about the reappointment of the beginner. It is the principal's responsibility to evaluate the novice's teaching and to make that recommendation. The beginner may, and should be encouraged to, share the

results of the principal's on-going evaluation so that appropriate mentor support can be provided.

The fact that teachers are now supervising peers raised some questions as to what the principal's supervisory responsibility should be in the future. Would it make more sense for the principal to be responsible for making certain that teachers meet minimum standards and give teachers the responsibility of coaching and supervising a minimal level? Wouldn't teachers, specialists in specific disciplines, be able to more effectively supervise and support colleagues in their subject areas rather than principals who are generalists or who have expertise in disciplines different than particular teachers?

E. Recommendations

Although there was some question as to its feasibility, given time constraints, focus groups participants recommended that principals take an individualized approach to working out procedures with mentors and mentees. There appeared to be a consensus that it would be beneficial for principals to meet with mentors and novices early on to lay the groundwork, to establish a philosphy, to guide them in their interactions with each other.

In such a 3-way conference, they would decide how to approach thorny issues, who should be involved or consulted in particular situations. As each school has its own personality and each principal his/her own relationship with staff members, an individualized approach which encourages flexibility so that ground rules among team members could change during the year, appeared to be a sensible approach to focus group participants.

F. The Cooperating Teacher Program

Focus group members perceived the CT program to be extremely important as the way in which future teachers are prepared will have a great impact on

thousand of children over my years. Experienced teachers appear to be very willing to assist the profession by assuming leadership roles in preparing new teachers.

A. The Principal's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities

Focus group participants distinguished between principal's roles and responsibilities toward the student-teacher and his/her supervision of the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher is employed by the district, unlike the student, who may seek employment at some time in the future. The district's appraisal are staff development programs and in place are accesible to the beginning teacher.

During the focus group discussion, it was suggested that principals might serve as mentors or models who could assist cooperating teachers in learning how to observe and confer with student-teachers if these supervisory skills and techniques were needed.

Another role of the principal is to offer personal support to the cooperating teacher. Sharing a classroom all day with a stranger can be stressful for cooperating teachers who are role-models for students and who sometimes feel the need to be perfect every second of the day. It was also noted that cooperating teachers sometimes experience tension as the result of the presence of the college supervisor as they have a sense of accountability for the student's performance. Emotional support from the principal, showing interest in what the cooperating teacher is doing, dropping in to see if she needs assistance and listening to accomplishments and successes ease the cooperating teacher's burden.

Both principal and cooperating teacher are accountable to the children in the school. The principal, therefore, needs to monitor the training situation to ensure that children are taught the agreed upon curriculum and that the needs of children are being met as, in some cases, progress can be

slower with a less than able student-teacher in the classroom.

A suggestion was made that the principal evaluate the student-teacher when the student felt comfortable enough. This would enable the principal to write a good, sound letter of recommendation for the student which would carry weight with other principals. Also, the observation and evaluation of student teachers by principals would send a message to colleges that the principal is aware of the quality of students that they are placing in the field. A third advantage if an evaluation visit by the principal is that he/she would serve as "another pair of eyes" for the cooperating teacher who would then have the opinion of a neutral third party who doesn't have the emotional ties that the cooperating-teacher has with the student.

B. Problems Experienced by Practitioners

Members of the focus group identified a number of problems mostly associated with the university supervisor/cooperating teacher relationship. These include: 1) the fact that cooperating-teachers have little input into the grade students receive from the supervisor, yet major responsibility for on-site training; 2) the lack of promptness of supervisory visits by university supervisors; 3) the distance the university supervisor has to travel, the number of students for which he/she is responsible and problems with arranging schedules so that all parties can discuss the student's programs; 4) the fact that college supervisors are often adjunct faculty who are poorly trained in supervision and receive little support and direction from the institution which employs them; and 5) that some colleges and universities do not appear to be keeping up with developments in the field such as: writing process, cooperative learning, peer coaching, whole language, and using manipulatives to teach mathematics.

C. College/University Involvement in Planning the CT Program

Questions were raised as to the extent of college and university participation in the development of the Cooperating Teacher Program. It was noted that the State of Connecticut has two boards: elementary and secondary education are accountable to the Board of Education and colleges and universities, to the Board of Higher Education. Each Board has its own commissioner and established its own policies, students, and procedures. The area in which they intersect is teacher preparation programs through teacher certification policies and program approval.

Colleges and universities have participated in the creation of new standards for the approval of college teacher preparation programs through CACUTE, an organization which represent deans of schools of education. Also, five regional consortium have been established in different areas of the State to provide training for cooperating-teachers. Colleges, local school districts, and regional service centers participate in designing and offering training programs. Many college faculty have also participatead in focus groups as part of the development of the Connecticut Competency Instrument and have since been trained as state assessors. They were also participated in invalid with the validation study of the

D. School Improvement

Practitioners in the focus group reported that students seem better prepared and have had training in the Connecticut Competencies Standards for recent graduation as well as expectations appear to have been raised in the eyes of the teachers and principals. One principal reported that she had 80 applicants for a teaching position, in her school. Applicants who showed promise during the interview when invited back to give a demonstration lesson,

something unheard of when teachers already in the school were first employed by the district. Another principal noted that college students have great enthusiasm which has a positive "ripple" effect on staff in his school.

Focus group participants had very positive attitudes towards their participation with colleges and universities in the preparation of teachers and indicated that there was great potential for school improvement through relationships with higher education institutions.

Findings Across Cases

An examination of data across cases does reveal some patterns and regularities: however, given the sample size, generalizations must be considered with caution. Guba (1978) offers some appropriate advice to researchers/evaluators regarding the generalizabity of naturalistic inquiry findings:

> ...in the spirit of naturalistic inquiry he should regard each possible generalization only as a working hypothesis, to be tested again in the next encounter and again in the encounter after that...(p. 281).

The findings presented here are offered in that spirit.

Joint Program Findings: The Principal's Role

1. The four principals in this study were key to the success of the BEST and CT Programs in their schools

This is not surprising as each of these principals perceived themselves as leaders in implementing EEA programs by virture of submitting an application to be an Administrator Fellow. Each of them appeared to have a high level of interest in and knowledge about the CT and BEST programs. In this respect, they are atypical of Connecticut principals, who were described in the recent statewide evaluation report as (CT State Department, 1989) being detached and uninvolved with these programs.

Virtually all individuals interviewed, including the principals themselves, believed that principals' attitudes about the programs definitely affected their success. The fact that the principals encouraged teacher leaders to participate, supported them, and conveyed the importance of

participation to other staff, often by example, was deemed to be very important by participants in the schools and by focus group members.

By and large, almost all teachers in the study, mentors, beginners, and student-teachers, appreciated the supervision and support received from principals and appeared to want more contact with them. Although they understood and were sympathetic to the time constraints which principals face, they generally liked to confer with principals about their work with novices or children and liked to have principals visit their classrooms. They viewed principals in a positive light and saw them as sources of support.

This finding is particularly interesting as administrators attending the Fellowship Program noted that principals have not been included in the development of the BEST and CT programs to the extent that they should have. One of the principals interviewed shared this perception and two others, as well as several teachers, recommended that the State design a brief training program to assist principals in learning more about the programs and in developing their supervisory skills.

2. There was agreement among subjects that 3 out of 4 principals carried out the supervisory roles of monitor coordinator and enabler; 2 out of 4 principals were also seen as evaluators.

It was very clear that principals took it upon themselves to check to see how "things" were going" with mentor teachers and cooperating teachers. They were available for logistical support i.e. arranging for common meeting times, setting up visits to other classrooms, etc.) and to intervene when problems developed (i.e. with college supervisors, or interpersonal conflicts between students and cooperating-teachers, etc.) They felt responsible for providing student-teachers with quality placements and accountable to novices for teachers in their schools who were selected as mentors and cooperating-teachers.

This monitor coordinator responsibility is probably not a new one for principals who have had student-teachers in their schools in the past. Their roles and responsibilities with cooperating teachers and student-teachers have not changed significantly from what they where; however, when the BEST program became part of these schools, the principals automatically assumed responsibility for it.

This finding is particularly interesting given the results of the State program evaluation report (CT State Department, 1989) in which evaluators asked all participant groups (mentors, beginners, cooperating-teachers and student-teachers) if they felt cooperating-teachers and mentor teachers should be monitored. All groups answered "yes;" however less than half of mentor teachers thought monitoring was necessary. When those favoring monitoring were asked who should monitor cooperating-teachers and mentor teachers, only 3% of cooperating teachers suggested the school principal, while 30% recommended the university supervisor. Mentors favored district facilitators, although 15% suggested the school principal.

It is encouraging that 3 out of 4 principals were perceived by teacher leaders and novices as enablers, despite their evaluation function.

3. The principal's mindset toward supervision, coupled with involvement in State development and training activities, were critical factors in the principal's supervision and support of program participants.

Principals who are strongly committed to supervision and who act on their committment, most likely will do a better job of recruiting and supervising and supporting BEST and CT program participants than those who are less

able supervisors. Also principals who have more contact with the State about there programs, perhaps by participating in training activities, may be more willing to help these programs be successful in their schools. There are two hypotheses which should be tested in future studies.

Two of the four principals in this study had participated in state assessor training. One used his knowledge of the Connecticut Competencies to familiarize his staff with them in brief training sessions. Two principals also served as district-wide facilitators and thus had more specialized knowledge and training about the programs. This additional involvement with the State may have been central to their interest in and support of BEST and CT programs participation.

The four principals also appeared to be strongly committed to supervision and were very active supervisors in their schools. One principal, in particular, seemed very knowledgable of supervisory techniques and stated that he gave supervision a very high priority. Another principal made it very clear that establishing a positive professional climate in his school was a major goal. A third principal did a considerable amount of group training with teachers.

Contextual variables such as school enrollment, number of staff, number of pairs of program particpanpts, did not appear to negatively effect the principal's supervision and support or program participants. In fact, the principal of the largest school, with the highest number of program participants, appeared to be one of the most pro-active in supervising and supporting program participants. The fact that she had more pairs of teachers participating than in others schools may have given her a critical mass to do some group training and sharing that was less possible in schools with fewer pairs.

4. There was disagreement among subjects as to the nature of and extent of sharing of supervision of novice teachers between principals and teacher leaders.

Some principals believed that a sharing did exist: others did not. However, the four principals were not at all intimidated by the fact that veteran teachers were given some supervisory responsibility for novices. In fact, their reaction was just the opposite. They applauded the fact that novice teachers were getting more feedback and supervision. The involvement of teachers in the supervision of peers also helped teachers to better understand the difficult job of principal, particularly when supervising teachers and striving to effect change in them. Their attitudes about sharing were somewhat similar to the 18 principals in the Gillette and Stern Study (1988) who experienced the sharing of instructional leadership as a gain for the principal. However, the sharing of supervisory responsibility for beginning teachers and student-teachers which took place within the 4 schools did not occur in a consciously articulated, planned fashion. None of the four principals actually met with teacher leaders and agreed to the supervisory behaviors which each would perform: principals and teacher leaders simply carried out their supervisory roles and responsibilities based on their own perceptions of their job.

5. There was no consensus among subjects as to the effect of the BEST and CT programs on the principal's role.

Some subjects saw these programs as increasing the accountability and the paperwork of principals. Most teachers viewed these programs, particularly BEST, as lightening principals' responsibilities: relieving them of the burden of worrying about the novice as someone else, a peer, was at work supporting that individual.

By and large, the four principals did not see these programs as having a great impact on their supervisory roles and responsibilities. This may be due to several reasons: (1) all four principals, two in particular, appeared to be very strong, active supervisors. Principals who are aleady doing an effective job supervising, may not view these programs as adding any additional burden. They simply continue to do well that which they are already doing; (2) as pilot schools, there were not many pairs of participants in each school, perhaps not enough to create a significant impact (3) Although one principal did provide teachers with training sessions on the Connecticut Competencies and another brought teachers together in groups, the four principals did not appear to capitalize on the opportunity created by the presence of these progress to any great extent to change the culture of their schools, to move the school forward to meet long term school improvement goals.

6. Although virtually all subjects saw these programs as upgrading the profession and improving the quality of teaching in their schools, the BEST and CT programs were not incorporated into any long-term plans for school improvement.

Subjects saw these programs as improving the quality of education in their schools and in schools in general. They saw many positive efforts of these programs. They reported that the programs set higher expectations for educators and gave them added motivation. The BEST and CT programs provide more structure to teacher preparation which was badly needed. Principals used knowledge and skills gained in their training with all teachers and the programs have increased professional dialogue among all parties.

From the researcher's perspective, however, participants within schools have given little thought as to how these programs might contribute to the

restructuring of their individual schools or to long term school improvement goals. It did not appear that schools acutally had any long-term, agreed upon school improvement goals. Links with local colleges and universities with this purpose in mind were non-existent; for example, the notion of professional development centers through college-school collaboration did not surface at any time in the interviews.

The Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) and the Principal's Supervisory Role(s) and Responsibilities.

Program Documents

The beginning teacher, the supervisory building administrator, the mentor and statewide assessors are the central figures in the BEST Program. These experienced educators provide intensive support and assessment in inducting the beginning tacher into the profession (Goranson). The literature (Goranson) describing the BEST program further states that "..the Mentor and building administrator form a support team to assist the begining teacher in developing teacher competency. (p. 2)."

In addition to assigning each beginning teacher with a mentor, the building administrator is expected to provide (Goranson)::

> support for the beginning teacher with the assistance of the mentor. The building administrator facilitates the mentoring process by arranging for common planning time as well as opportunities for the mentor and beginning teacher to observe each other's teaching and to participate in professional development programs (p.5).

The four principals in this study fulfilled all of these requirements and more.

In a document published by the Connecticut State Department of Education entitled, "Principal's Involvement in the Best Program," one principal described her role in the BEST program. According to this administrator, her role was to (Perrotta):

- cultivate the relationship between mentor and beginning teacher;
- guide the mentor in a way that contributes to the growth of beginning teachers and to the growth of the mentor;
- help the mentor and beginning teacher to understand the work of schools and this school in particular;
- explain the requirements and insight of leadership;
- relay knowledge of how people work together;
- insure that the mentor and beginning teacher have time to observe one another, teach and confer;
- enhance collegiality, creating occasions for professional dialogue;
- develop a common language, a vocabulary of instruction;
- provide ongoing support; and
- help the beginning teacher understand the value of the mentor.

There are commonalities between the supervisory and support behaviors of principals in this study and those identified above; however, some of the items above convey an imbalance in the principal/mentor relationship, that is, principals have the knowledge and power and mentors need a great deal of structure and direction.

The above document also included a sample calendar (Perrotta) of suggested activities for principals from the State Department of Education (see below).

Lastly, subsequent to the completion of this study, the State Department of Education published a School Administrator's Handbook (1989). Although the Handbook includes a good description of the BEST program and its regulations, oddly enough, it does not address principals' supervisory roles and responsibilities to BEST participants.

The Four Pilot Schools

Subjects in this study recognized that the principal has professional

responsibility and legal (contractual) supervisory responsibility to the mentor teacher and to the beginning teacher as individuals and also to them as participants in the BEST program. In each case, it was clear that principals supervised and evaluated both types of teachers; however, the nature, intensity and level of supervision of each was based on the fact that one was tenured and experienced and the other was not. Also, district guidelines specifically state the frequency of evaluation necessary for beginners and veterans.

In fact, principals with new teachers mentioned that they made a point of dropping in on their classrooms often. One indicated that the content of supervisory conferences with novices was focused on relationship building and setting expectations, areas which were not necessary to address with experienced teachers. Another principal explained that his supervisory observations, what he looked at, was based on the teacher's needs and level of cometency. He also explained that he helped to counsel one beginner out of the profession. Another principal met with beginners in groups to help them to prepare for upcoming school events.

Principals had great confidence in and respect for teacher leaders. Although some made frequent classroom "drop-in" visits with all teachers, by-and-large, principals did not offer experienced teachers the same degree of direct supervision and evalution that they did of beginners.

Principals' Supervisory Roles

A typology of eight supervisory roles of principals was described earlier. The three principals in this study who worked with mentor teachers and beginners, when looked at as a group, were described by subjects, including themselves, as enacting the eight roles: trainer, role-model, cheerleader/recruiter, enabler, evaluator, mentor, backseat observer, and

monitor-coordinator. However, an examination across cases reveals that when describing principals' supervision, there was agreement between two subjects or more only on three roles: evaluator, enabler, and monitor/coordinator.

As individuals, no one principal carried out all roles. Only one principal was described by the subject as a mentor: two principals were described by one subject as a role-model; and one principal was seen by one subject as a trainer. Most likely, these descriptions account for the idiosyncratic behavior of principals who had particular strengths in certain areas.

The size of the study sample and the fact that the pilot schools had so few pairs of program participants, however, limits the usefulness of these role descriptors: however, in a larger state-wide quantitative study, they might prove to be helpful.

Principals Activities

What specifically did principals do in their supervision and support of mentor and beginning teachers?

As a group, the 4 principals carried out the following supervisory support practices:

- encouraged teachers to become mentors
- placed beginning teachers with mentors
- informally assessed the mentoring process (i.e. checked to see that meetings were taking place between the two parties.)
- arranged for release time so teachers could get together
- encouraged teacher attendance at conferences
- helped to set up visits to other classrooms by beginners and mentors
- served as a communication link to enable teachers to be informed of state-wide developments

- strived to establish good relationships with beginners and to maintian working relationships with teacher leaders
- established beginning teachers' support group
- conducted group meetings with mentors
- gave mentor article to read on mentoring
- visited classrooms of beginning teacher frequently
- modeled good supervisory behavior for mentors
- informally visited teachers' classrooms, with more frequent visits to the beginner's classroom
- served as a neutral third party when needed
- served as a support and resource when needed
- offered suggestions when appropriate
- formally evaluated mentor teachers and beginning teachers

Distinctions Between Principals and Mentor's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities.

The principal has supervisory responsibility for all teachers in a school including beginners. The mentor teacher works with one teacher. Of the five supervisory roles of mentor teachers identified in the typology (enabler/supporter, inductor into school culture, coach/critic, conflict resolver, and evaluator), subjects described mentors as enabler/supporters and coach/critic. One mentor was viewed as a conflict resolver by 2 or more parties as in this case, she helped the beginner to resolve an interpersonal conflict with another teacher.

The description of 2 out of 3 mentors as coach/critic is encouraging as one of the warnings made by Gillette and Stern (1988) was that the mentoring program would not last if it was seen only as an acculturation program and not

tied to instruction. Since then, the State Department, in its training, has placed a greater emphasis on mentors as helping beginners to improve instruction. The findings of the 1988-89 program evaluation (CT State Department) showed a dramatic shift in how mentors supported teachers. From offering primarily moral support, mentors have moved to providing beginners with support with logistics and support with teaching.

Although principals and mentors were both viewed as enablers, it is encouraging that mentors were not described as evaluators or assessors. Subjects agreed that the principal has the responsibility for district evaluation of the novice. This was also the view of focus group panelists.

In the School Administrators Handbook (CT State Department, 1989), the responsibilities of mentors are listed as follows:

- Meet weekly (approximately 30 minutes) with the beginning teacher during the school year and record activities and meetings in a mentor log.
- Observe the beginning teacher and provide classroom demonstrations for the beginning teacher on at least eight occasions during the school year.
- Provide support for the development of the beginning teacher's skills as defined by the Connecticut Teaching Competencies, including planning of instruction, classroom management, and instruction and assessment of student learning.
- Assist the beginning teacher in preparing for the assessment process.
- Complete the appropriate follow-up seminars provided by the State Department of Education. (p. 5).

In this study, the 3 mentor teachers fulfilled the responsibilities of mentor as described in the Handbook (CT State Department, 1989). Although they offered emotional support to beginners, they also dealt with instructional issues. Specifically, the mentors did the following:

- offered emotional support to mentors to build their confidence

- prepared the novice for state-wide assessment of teaching competencies
- offered insights about children
- explained grade level expectations
- offered teaching ideas and suggested materials
- observed beginners teaching and gave feedback
- suggested visits to other classrooms
- helped beginner to learn how to work with classroom aide
- helped to resolve an interpersonal conflict with a peer
- provided basic information about the school
- suggested classroom management procedures
- offered help on how to discipline children

Although there is some overlap between principal and mentor's supervision and support of beginners as both provide emotional support to the novice and strive to raise the level of teaching competencies, principal and mentors did not discuss their observations of novice teachers with each other. Subjects viewed contact with principals as being more official and formal than that with mentors.

Also beginning teachers tended to differentiate between the kinds of issues they would bring to mentors and those they would raise with principals. Major issues, those of a very serious nature, were meant for the principal while emotional support and advice on classroom nitty-gritty issues were seen as more appropriate for mentors. Although principals and mentors are referred to as a team in the BEST literature, they appeared to work independently of each other toward similar goals.

The Cooperating Teacher Program (CT) and the Principal's Supervisory Roles and Responsibilities

Program Documents

The School Administrator's Handbook (CT State Department, 1989), identifies the following responsibilities of principals in relation to the Cooperating Teacher Program (p. 1):

- collaborates with college placement officials and district facilitator to place student teachers with cooperating teachers
- meet the student teacher and welcome him or her to your building
- visit the student teacher's classroom
- attend regular meetings and workshops for school administrators
- ensure that cooperating teacher does not serve as mentor at the same time
- if time permits observe a class and giv e feedback
- if time permits evaluate student teachers using your district's evaluation process

The Four Pilot Schools

Subjects did not perceive principals to have legal (contractual) supervisory responsibility to student-teachers as they do with cooperating teachers who are tenured employees; however, all subjects, including the principals themselves, saw principals as having professional supervisory responsibility to student-teachers. The principal was also viewed as being accountable for the educational program in the school, thus having a responsibility to pupils and parents; that is, to ensure that pupils' education would not be compromised because they are sometimes taught by teachers-in-training.

In the researchers' opinion, the four principals showed a very high level of interest in the training of student-teachers and committment toward offering the school as a training site. Although all participants expected the cooperating-teacher to perform the on-going, daily supervision of the student and to be the primary contact person with the college supervisor, subjects counted on principals for support and feedback and expected principals to take an interest in them and their work. Cooperating teachers counted on principals to help if problems developed. Although student-teachers had little conception of the principal's role, principals were seen as important to the student teachers' feelings of welcome and worth in a school.

Principal's Supervisory Roles

When looked at as a group, the 4 principal's were described as enacting 6 of the 8 supervisory roles in the typology: monitor coordinator, trainer, role-model, enabler, backseat observer, and evaluator. Again, no one principal was perceived as carrying out all 6 roles.

Only one principal desribed herself as a trainer and only one cooperating-teacher described her principal as a role-model. No one principal

was described as enacting more than 4 roles. There were of 3 roles across cases in which there was agreement between two or more subjects: monitor coordinator, enabler, and evaluator. Principals described as evaluators of student-teachers were those who did formal evaluations upon request from a student who wanted that experience. These three roles are identical to those supervisory roles attributed to principals by mentor teachers and beginning teachers which showed some trianguiation.

Principals' Activities

In working with cooperating teachers and student-teachers, the four principals as a group engaged in the following supervisory and support tasks.

- recruited cooperating teachers
- ensured that student-teachers had an opportunity to experience the full role of a teacher within a school and district
- provided a positive, professional environment for all teachers
- met with college supervisor, especially at the beginning of student placement
- monitored student's progress
- held round table discussion (mini informational seminars) with students
- visited classrooms on an informal basis
- listened to cooperating teacher when problems developed
- strived to make student feel comfortable and at home in the school
- informally and formally observed student teacher and gave feedback
- wrote letters of recommendations for the student
- hired students as substitute teachers after they completed their placement

- ensured that the person to which students were assigned were well qualified and that the placement is working.
- conducted teacher assessment of the student using the Connecticut Competencies
- formally observed and evaluated cooperating teachers

Distinctions Between Principals and Cooperating Teachers' Supervising Roles and Responsibilities

As mentioned earlier, subjects perceived the cooperating teacher as having the main responsibility for the daily, on-going supervision of the student. Of the 5 supervisory roles of the cooperating teachers in the typology of categories (enabler/supporter, inductor into school culture, coach/critic, conflict-resolver, and evaluator), cooperating teachers in this study were described by subjects as carrying out 4 roles: enabler/supporter, coach/critic, evaluator and inductor into school culture. However, there was agreement among subjects only when describing the roles of enabler/supporter and coach/critic, the same two roles which characterized mentor teachers' supervision of beginners.

The School Administrator's Handbook (CT State Department, 1989) identifies the following responsibilities of the cooperating-teacher:

- provide daily supervision of the student-teacher
- provide support for the development of the student-teacher's knowledge and instructional skills as defined by the Connecticut Teaching Competencies.
- Assist the college or university in its evaluation of the student-teacher in meeting the requirement of the student-teaching component of the teacher preparation program.
- Complete the appropriate follow-up seminars provided by the State Department of Education (p. 5).

Although this study would have benefitted from more data regarding cooperating teachers' supervision, it does appear that the coopeating teachers in this report did fulfill the above requirement and were similar to those cooperating teachers described in the Evaluation Report (CT State Department, 1989) as offering a balanced combination of moral, logistal and teaching support to student-teachers.

Cooperating-teachers' supervision is clinical: direct, intense, on-going and very connected to instruction. Principals supported student-teachers emotionally, monitored their placement, were available to intervene when necessary and provided a formal assessment or evaluation as a courtesy. Their supervision was supervision from a distance.

Discussion

The study raises some questions about principals' instructional supervisory roles and responsibilities in relation to those of teacher leaders'. Do principals and teachers collaborate or do they engage in "parallel supervision" of novices? Does the presence of teachers in supervisory roles actually undermine the notion of the principal as instructional leader? What is the real purpose of the supervision of student-teachers and beginners?

It is clear that teacher leaders in the four schools felt supported by their principals and principals were not threatened by teachers engaging in supervisory activities. It does not appear that much collaborative supervision took place, although principals and teachers shared professional responsibility for the supervision of novices.

This lack of collaboration was, in the researcher's opinion, basically due to the absence of discussion among the parties about their supervisory roles and responsibilities and methods of operation and, in the case of beginning teachers, the State requirement that confidentiality be maintained between the mentor and novice, thus prohibiting discussion between mentor and principal about the novice's actual teaching. The principal's official supervisory role as evaluator, as decision-maker about the beginning teacher's future, places the principal, the mentor and the novice on unequal footing, thus precluding the presence of parity among the three parties, a necessary pre-requisite for collaborative

supervision in the clinical (Goldhammer, 1969) sense so that it really works for teachers. Although simply conjecture on the part of the researcher, principals did not appear to carry out less supervision because teacher leaders were supervising. The four principals were very conscientious supervisors: in fact, their involvement in these programs may have increased their supervisory activity as 1) they felt responsible for the programs and did some things differently such as working with teachers in groups (Principal #1) and training teachers to become familiar with the Connecticut Competencies (Principal #2). It is also possible that the presence of a mentor supervising a beginning teacher served as a motivating factor for principals to be "on the ball" in terms of being familiar with the beginning teacher's performance.

The instructional leadership role of principals is broad and involves in-class supervision, staff and curriculum development, school-wide goal-setting, grant-writing, etc. The four principals were good facilitators: they enabled teacher leaders to carry out their roles. The act of supporting teacher leaders is an aspect of instructional leadership.

As mentioned earlier, principal #1 who had a critical mass of program participants did considerable group supervision. Working with student teachers, mentor teachers, or cooperating teachers in groups may be an example of how the BEST and CT programs will impact on a redefinition of the role of principal.

There is certainly plenty of work to be done to improve schools and principals know they cannot do it all. The BEST and CT programs present opportunities for school restructuring, yet to be realized. It would appear that principals and the newly trained cadre of teacher leaders, who really have been motivated by these programs, could jointly take on this challenge so that schools really work for principals, teachers and students.

Again, in the researcher's opinion, the presence of the BEST and CT programs does not diminish opportunities for instructional leadership on the part of principals and teachers together, but actually enhances them.

Recommendations

1) Principal Training:

State-wide training for principals should be considered on three fronts: 1) principals would benefit from additional information about the purposes of the BEST and CT programs and their roles in them. This training might take the form of brief job-alike workshops for principals only or workshops where principals and teachers meet in teams; 2) principals who are effective supervisors are more likely to do a better job or recruiting teacher leaders, supporting them in their work with novices, as well as supervising and supporting novices themselves; therefore, the State, in cooperation with universities may wish to develop systematic statewide training in supervision for principals; 3) the issue of collaborative leadership needs to be explored as part of this training, particularly with respect to its implications for i tructional supervision.

2) Role Clarification:

Teacher leaders, novice teachers, and principals really need to be clear about each other's roles, responsibilities and relationships as participants in the BEST and CT programs. In training workshops for either sub-groups or for teams, roles and responsibilities of all the major parties should be described and discussed.

3) Administrator's Handbook: Although the Handbook does a good job of describing the CT and BEST program and the regulations associated with them, it does not provide adequate explanation as to principals' roles and responsibilities, especially in connection with the BEST program. A section should be added containing this information.

4. Colleges and Universities

Although participants indicated that they valued relationships with colleges universities, there continue to be nagging issues associated with college-school relationships (e.g. placement, grading, supervision. Most of these concerns are not peculiar to Connecticut but really stem from the design of undergraduate pre-serivce programs and the lack of true collaboration between colleges and schools.

In its next stage of reform, the Department of Education may want to consider ways to facilitate school-college partnerships. Colleges and universities appear to be out of the picture and need to be brought in. As pre-service and in-service education are part of a continuum of teacher develelopment, teacher preparation programs at the college and school levels need to be meshed. The notion of the professional development center should be considered.

5. School Improvement: The four schools in this study did not appear to have well-formulated plans for school improvement that participants could describe. Although they viewed the CT and BEST programs as improving the quality of education is general, they did not connect these programs to the improvement of education in their schools in any concrete ways. How do these programs integrate within schools so as to contribute to school restructuring or to the building of school cultures which promote student and teacher development? Although the BEST and CT programs do support new leadership roles for teachers, school leaders have not conceptalized how these programs might contribute to a restructuring agenda. The State should begin to encourage individual schools to take the initiative to consider this question and to begin to experiment with various models of change within schools.

Acknowledgements

The researcher wishes to express appreciation and thanks to the teachers and principals who were interviewed for this study. The cooperation of Dr. Marjorie Bradley of the Connecticut State Department of Education was invaluable. Also, the author is appreciative of the assistance of Nancy Hanley who typed the manuscript.

References

Barth, R.S. (1986, March) The principal and the profession of teaching. The Elementary School Journal, 86 (4), 1 - 22.

Barth, R.S. (1988). School a community of learners. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools, (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (1989). Evaluation of the 1988-89 BEST support program and the 1988-89 cooperating teacher program. Harford, CT: Division of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Bureau of Evaluation and Assessment, Bureau of Evaluation and Student Assessment. Program Evaluation University.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (1989). Ideas at work: 16 exemplary practices of Connecticut administrators in implementing the Education Enhancement Act. Administrator Fellows Seminars. Hartford, CT.

Connecticut State Department of Education. The role of the principal. (Handout) Hartford, CT.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (1989) School Administrator's Handbook. Hartford, CT.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988, November). The futures of teaching. Educational Leadership. 46(3), 4-10.

Gillette, J.H., Stern B. (1988, June). Beginning educator support and training programs: organizational development research project: the principals perspective. (Available from Connecticut State Department of Education).

Goldhammer, R. (1969). (Clinical Supervision, Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Goranson, D. Jr. (Ed.). BEST, Beginning educator support and training program. Hartford, CT: State Department of Education.

Goranson, D. Jr. (Ed.) Cooperating teacher program. Hartford, CT: State Department of Education.

Guba, EG. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. CSE Monograph series in Evaluation No. 8 Los Angeles: Center for the study of Evaluation. University of California. Los Angeles. In M.Q. Patton, (1980) Qualitative Evaluation Methods. (p. 281). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers, East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Lieberman, A. (1981, February) Expanding the leadership team. Educational Leadership. 45 (5) 4 - 8.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (9), 648-653.

Lindle, C. (1989, March). Issues in instructional supervision: The lead teacher vs. the supervisor. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Little, J.W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In Lieberman (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools (pp. 78 - 106). New York: Teachers College Press.

Perrotta, C. A case study-one school's story in Principals' involvement in the BEST program. (Handout). Hartford, CT: State Department of Education.

Rodman, B. (1987). New York lawsuit higlights growing tension between principals, teachers over their roles. Education Week, January 14.

Shulman, J.H. (1988). Expert witnesses: mentor teachers and their colleagues. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington, D.C. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed. 289 863.

Trachtman, R., Levine, M. (1989, March). Towards a definition of teacher leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco.

United States (1983). National Commission on Excellence in Education. A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform: a report to the national and the Security of Education; U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.: The Commission.

Zimpher, N. L. and Rieger, S.R. (Eds.) (1988, Summer). Mentoring teachers: what are the issues? Theory Into Practice, XXVII (3).